Mr. Emil Steun.
Dec. 25th 1928.

Sincerely Yours
W. J. Peterson

FORD HALL NOON LECTURES

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO · DALLAS
ATLANTA · SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

FROM THE STANDPOINT OF RELIGIOUS VALUES

BY

HARRY F. WARD

Professor of Social Service, Boston University School of Theology
Secretary, The Methodist Federation for Social Service

The verbatim stenographic report of a series of noon day lectures delivered at Ford Hall, Boston, 1915, together with the questions and answers of the Forum period following each lecture

New York
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1919

Set up and electrotyped. Published, May, 1917.

VAIL-BALLOU COMPANY
BINGHAMTON AND NEW YORK

PREFACE

A School of Theology and the I. W. W. sitting together to discuss the labour problem! Can any conference more strange to our modern thinking be imagined! But could any conference more essentially logical be conceived! The bringing together, however, of these various groups into one harmonious student body was the function of a third idea in action, the Ford Hall Open Forum.

Ford Hall stands for free discussion of questions carrying a distinctive ethical message. It is in a large way a church for community religion. Within its walls every religious, racial and political element in the community have come together seeking for a faith common to all. Therefore, when the Boston University School of Theology sought for a place fit and proper for the exercise of the hospitality it contemplated, the platform of Ford Hall with its associations of the Open Forum was the natural place to seek.

The lectures here reproduced were originally presented by Dr. Ward to his students in the University. They attracted so much attention that a group of ministers asked to have them

repeated. Thereupon the School of Theology issued a general invitation to all to attend the course. It stated the aim of the course to be to present the broad, essential facts concerning the constituent groups of the labour movement in the United States, and discuss its main demands from the standpoint of religious values.

The Boston Baptist Social Union gladly opened Ford Hall to the meetings, and men of all classes and creeds, of all ranks, standards and opinions, gathered to listen to an official representative of a School of Theology expound the labour movement. Ministers and laymen, employers and employees sat together and asked questions at the close of the addresses. The lectures met with a warm reception. The resolutions presented by the I. W. W. at their close may be taken as fairly illustrative of the feeling of the thinking public toward the addresses. It is in response to a very general request for their publication that this volume is presented to the public. The text is from a verbatim stenographic report, with no changes whatever.

I was privileged to preside at these lectures and to conduct the question period. I feel that this task was indeed an honour, and I regard it as an equal privilege as editor to present this volume to the larger public.

WILLIAM HORTON FOSTER.

INTRODUCTION

Can an interpreter of modern industry come out of a theological seminary? An intelligent twentieth century citizen would no more expect it than did the average man of Jesus' time suppose that any good thing could come out of Nazareth. But I ought to have taken it for granted after my long acquaintance with such seminary professors as Rauschenbusch, Fagnani, Mathews, Hall, Vedder, Ryan and Rowe. Still I was amazed when I witnessed the work of Prof. Harry Ward in this remarkable course of lectures. His range of knowledge, breadth of vision, depth of sympathy, unruffled equanimity, splendid poise, and remarkable powers of ready and accurate speech simply overwhelm me. That I myself was not bewitched nor hypnotised was attested by the extraordinary response of the entire audience that filled Ford Hall, day after day. It was a conglomerate crowd of ministers, business and professional men, Socialists, Labor Unionists and I. W. W.'s that made up that audience. They all seemed to feel very much as I did, and yet the labour problem was

handled from A to Z without hesitation, no sidestepping and unequivocally.

And this extraordinarily unique situation was intensified by the fact that the lecturer was not essaying an adventure on his own hook and at his own risk, but was speaking as the representative of the Theological School of Boston University in a hall freely given for the purpose by a great lay organisation, the Boston Baptist Social Union. And, to cap the climax, the National Industrial Union of Textile Workers of the I. W. W. fraternity drafted resolutions expressing their appreciation of the whole enterprise and especially of Professor Ward. I doubt if the like of this has ever been known before. And remember that the audience had the right to ask questions after each address and no vague, uncertain or unsatisfactory statement could pass unchallenged.

No small measure of the success of this immensely significant enterprise was due to Mr. William Horton Foster, who not only presided throughout with great skill, but who also had much to do with initiating and carrying forward the whole idea. In fact, it was an outgrowth, in some ways, of his work as Secretary of the Ford Hall Foundation, an organisation given up to promoting the Open Forum Movement.

GEORGE W. COLEMAN.

Feb. 25, 1915.

In behalf of the I. W. W. Propaganda League of Boston we wish to express our sincere thanks to the Baptist Social Union, also to the Boston University School of Theology and particularly to Prof. Ward for making it possible to present to the people of Boston the most vital social problem of the day, namely, the Labor Movement.

We wish to compliment Prof. Ward for the unbiased, unprejudiced, and able manner in which he presented the controversy between capital and labor and its causes.

The viewpoint taken by Prof. Ward coupled with his remarkable exposition of the case of labor, we feel will meet with the general approval of the organization and its members.

It has ever been the policy of the I. W. W. and its members to regard the conflict between the classes in society from the viewpoint of the worker, and we believe that Prof. Ward in his course of lectures on the labor movement has presented labor's Cause in such a clear and analytical manner, that one would be led to believe that he had acquired his extensive knowledge of the Labor Movement from actual experience in Industry.

We sincerely hope that the course of lectures just completed will be published and given as wide a circulation as possible.

Committee:

Signed { Adolph Lessig,
Nathan Herman,
Guy Curtis,
John J. Fraser.

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

I. TRADE UNIONS

The labour movement is one of the great social forces that are making the modern world. It is the effort of the wage earners to secure their full share in the gains of our industrial civilisation; to secure also their full share in the control of that civilisation. In its present form it has three groupings, the trade unions, the socialists, and the syndicalists. In this country the predominant labour organisation is the trade union — which groups the workers according to the craft which they follow, around the tools that they use. These trade unions are centralised in the American Federation of Labor which has existed about thirty-three years and comprises now about two million members, with about half a million other organised workers who are not affiliated, the principal element in that group being the Railroad Brotherhoods.

The actual strength of the trade union movement is much greater than its numbered membership, because a large proportion of the indus-

trial workers who are not in its membership still follow its lead. That means that the American Federation of Labor has in it about 18 per cent. of those available for membership, because it operates in only two of the broad divisions of the gainfully employed in this country. We have something over twenty-nine million gainfully employed in this country, in five groups. In those two groups where the American Federation of Labor operates we have a little over twelve million people. Now that membership is gathered by means of organisers who endeavour to persuade first the workers to join the unions. Where the trades are organised under the union label they endeavour to get the employers to adopt the unions, and to persuade the workers to use union made goods. Of course the latter method is confined to certain trades or goods which are consumed by industrial wage earners.

That membership is gathered without distinction of sex, creed or colour, although there is about the same discrimination against women that there is in the world at large. It reflects pretty accurately the general social situation. For example, the Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, which is the largest women's union, is officered practically entirely by men. There has been a great increase in the last five years in the organisation of women, due largely to the activ-

ity of the Women's Trade Union League, and of course a changing sentiment within labour circles concerning the activity of women in labour affairs.

The government of the trade union is a differentiated matter. You have your central American Federation of Labor with its national offices, sustained by a per capita tax. You have your city and state federations. These deal with matters of general interest and general policy. The real governmental power is in the national and international unions, one hundred and eleven of them, which compose the American Federation of Labor. They really govern the labour world. They have in them some twenty thousand local labour unions. In addition there are some six hundred and forty which have a charter directly from the American Federation of Labor, either because there is no international union in that trade or because the local workers are not numerous enough to be organised according to trades.

The American Federation of Labor cannot technically be held responsible for the acts of the international unions. There is a certain degree of moral responsibility, but it would be almost as unfair to hold the American Federation of Labor responsible for the McNamara crimes as it would be to hold the United States responsible

for the recent lynchings in Georgia. The local unions have very little democratic power; for power is centralised, to an extraordinary degree almost, in the international unions. They have the power of excommunication (and they do excommunicate) and the punishment is, of course, that the places of strikers can be filled if need be by the international union itself, and there is really where its power of control lies and is centred.

In so far as the general policy of trade unions is concerned,— their relation to public welfare,— whatever may be the defects in this country the social gains that have come to us from them are considerable. They have stood first of all for the protection of the workers, the protection of their lives, of their moral and intellectual welfare. They have been a school of democracy. Their influence over the immigrant group in training them for American life can scarcely be over-estimated. They promote the self-expression of labour as opposed on the one hand to philanthropy and on the other hand to legislation. They democratically develop workers themselves to pursue the path of their own development.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Consider some of the outstanding policies which have generally prevailed. The funda-

mental policy is collective bargaining. The basic contention of the American Federation of Labor is that there must be and is a partnership between capital and labour, that their mutual dependence one upon another creates a joint moral obligation, that they must work together and that their partnership must be realised through collective bargaining, through the power of labour to sell its labour and to agree to the terms under which it shall work in joint capacity through its chosen representatives. There is an economic necessity here. Under the concentrated conditions of modern industry, labour of course develops side by side a similar concentration and the two groups (if business is to be done according to the basis of to-day, economically speaking) must work together. There must be joint action on the part of these two groups. To attempt to enforce the right of capital to deal to-day with the individual labourer is just about as reasonable as to ask labour (or for labour to assert the right or the demand) to deal with individual stockholders of an enterprise. Of course we have been recently told on the stand in this country by the men responsible for some of the largest industries that the individual stockholders had no responsibility whatever for labour conditions.

There is not only an economic necessity but an

ethical necessity here. Labour is not free to-day unless it can bargain jointly. That is perfectly obvious. It is under the compulsion of hunger and of necessity. It does not own its tools; it does not own its resources; it does not own the things necessary for its work in the large and highly organised industries to-day, and ethically labour is neither free nor in the attitude or condition of justice unless it has the right to bargain collectively and jointly. Now that is generally conceded. I suppose it has more opposition in these United States than in any other civilised country, and that is one of the anomalies of our situation, that a country which has developed the representative principle in government is yet under the influence of a belated individualism and largely attempts to deny that principle in industry. And yet the days are changing. The principle of collective bargaining will largely be admitted to-day (perhaps by the majority), although some folks are still living in the eighteenth century and others still live in Colorado. But generally that principle is conceded.

It was a remarkable exhibition on the stand before the Industrial Commission to see the men who have the largest financial interests in this country one after another admitting this principle, and then one after the other testifying that

there had been no attempt in the industries which they control to work out the principle and to apply it. Now if you admit the right of labour to bargain collectively and then refuse to have any dealings whatsoever with the collective organisation of labour you are giving labour a loaf of bread which turns out to be made of stone. Of course the collective bargaining may turn out to be autocracy on the one side. There has always been the possibility of oligarchy when you have attempted to organise a republic but that has never held our hand from attempting to carry through further democratic organisation. Men have to face danger and perils as the price or risk of progress. But in this day and age to refuse to enter into any collective bargaining with labour, to admit the principle but decline to work out the form of it, is simply to leave the whole industrial world in chaos, and to drive it into a condition of anarchy, of guerilla warfare, which is absolutely unsupportable in our modern civilisation.

THE CLOSED SHOP

Then comes the policy of the closed shop and those who object to collective bargaining object to it because it leads to the closed shop. Now there are different kinds of a closed shop. One is the shop that is closed to organised

labour, and that passes before the unsuspecting public under the guise of an open shop. It is largely promoted by a group of men in this country who are interested in maintaining a shop that is absolutely closed against organised labour. There may be such a thing as an "open shop" but as an experienced economist and industrial observer said to me not long ago, "I am still looking for one." They do occur, of course, here and there, non-union and union men working side by side. The tendency is, however, to work one way or the other, to become either a non-union shop or a union shop.

Now the terms non-union and closed shop are not necessarily identical. There are two kinds of closed shop, one is the shop where whoever comes in is required to join a union, and the other where no man is taken unless he is a union man. For all practical purposes they are identical and may be so considered. The fundamental thing about the closed shop in judging it is that it is a war measure. It is not a policy of organised labour nearly as much in Europe as in this country. It is not written in trade agreement contracts in England as in this country. What is the reason? It is in the different attitude of the employer and the courts in England. Labour has been driven in this country by the opposition of employers, by industrial militarism

and by the ancient attitude of courts to insist more upon the closed shop than it does in England, and the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court making constitutional laws by which the employer may discharge men for belonging to a union will have a tendency to accentuate both the fighting spirit and the fighting method. We shall hear more of the closed shop because of that decision.

The closed shop must be judged on two grounds, one economic and the other ethical. Does it lead to economic efficiency? You will have many manufacturers fight it on the grounds of inefficiency, asserting that it is absolutely inefficient from the standpoint of production. Now in the long run this issue will be settled in the field of efficiency but it will not be settled simply in the field of efficiency from the standpoint of the employer alone, not efficiency in production alone; it will be efficiency from the standpoint of social welfare, whether the total human results are more or less under that system than under any other.

When you come to the ethical ground, it is the question of the degree of compulsion which is exercised to secure the closed shop. We feel instinctively and naturally, we Americans, that a man has the right to control his labour as he pleases. We do not always see the anarchical

implication of that right. We do not always see how we have had to limit that right in government and how it will increasingly have to be limited in industry. But you must remember if you are going to argue that an individual man has the right to sell his labour on his own terms, to work for whom he pleases and as he pleases, then by the same token other men have the right to decline to work with him, and if they exercise that right that simply means the right of a certain kind of closed shop. On the other side you have compulsion exercised because the man who declines to accept union standards is lowering the standards of living for the whole group and you have compulsion working on both sides. When that compulsion becomes actually coercion you have an entirely different situation, and while on pure grounds of social welfare it will be and may be increasingly necessary to exercise coercion (we are doing it all the time through our labour legislation), the principles of ethics and sound government insist that this right is a right which belongs to the community as a whole. It belongs to the majority and it does not belong to any single group in the community. The closed shop without the element of coercion, brought about by moral suasion which has no coercion in it, may be of the highest ethical value to the whole community.

Then there is the preferential shop, where the right of any man to work is recognised but where the preference is given to the union man as long as his character and efficiency is of equal grade with the other man (on the ground that the union is bearing the burden, is paying the bills for improving labour conditions) where he is given a preference in employment and where, when it comes to discharge, he is given a preference and retained. In other words the right of any individual to seek employment is recognised, but if he is a non-union man he can only get the first preference by showing himself to have better efficiency and better character than the union man. Usually you get out of the preferential shop the union shop because all the people who are there are union people. It naturally works out in that way. It has come about by a perfectly natural, ethical process because the union has been raising its standards and furnishing the best possible workmen. You have what is practically a closed shop without any of the coercion measures.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

What about industrial disputes? The average picture that has until recently prevailed of the agent of the union (he used to be the walking delegate), the business agent, is that he was

a nuisance in the community who stirred up trouble, an undesirable citizen because it was his chief task to foment strikes. That is a popular picture that has prevailed of the union organizer until quite recently. Now what are the facts? The facts are to-day that the chief business of the successful business agent of the union is to prevent strikes instead of to promote them, because labour has learned all too bitterly the cost of war methods, and the strike, of course, is a war method that belongs to the Stone Age. To-day organised labour is much more interested in preventing strikes than it is in calling them. For example, in 1913 organised labour in this country settled over three thousand disputes without strikes, secured improved conditions in over three thousand cases without strikes. Organised labour called in that year less than one thousand strikes, and of all the strikes in this country in that year organised labor had to do with between fifty-five and seventy per cent. Organised labour is not to be held entirely responsible for all the strikes. Carroll D. Wright has said that 75 per cent. were occasioned because of the refusal of employers to arbitrate. In every country in the world except England, and possibly Australia and New Zealand, in the last five years there has been an increase of labour difficulties, of industrial disputes, an increase

in strikes. This condition has not obtained in England because of the fact to which I referred some time ago, because the principle of collective bargaining and the rights of organised labour are recognised more by English employers and English courts, because organised labour is stronger there, because it has secured a greater opportunity of political expression, and where it is stronger you have fewer strikes. Also we have had a tendency to increasingly bitter and violent strikes in this country in the last few years, but it is interesting to note that they occurred in industries that are not organised. Some of the bitterest outbreaks in recent years in this country have been because the conditions were unbearable. That was true in Lawrence. Now by the same token conditions that have obtained in some of the mining centres in this country have led to action on the part of the local workers against the desires and wishes and policy of the national organisation, an action that was detrimental because it was badly planned and came at the wrong time. Conditions had become unbearable and drove the workers to action.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

How are they going to settle disputes? By arbitration and conciliation? We have organised a number of state boards of arbitration which

are of very little use. They furnish an ornamental decoration on the statute book, an ornamental (or otherwise) office for certain political attachés, but they have not proved themselves of very much value, partly for the reason that they have usually come into the conflict too late. You do not stand much chance of arbitrating a difficulty when a man has got his fighting blood up and is bound to win. That is one reason why arbitration boards, that are really political boards, fail.

The same thing is true of unofficial arbitration boards because more and more the disputes in industry become technical, have technical points. If they are to be arbitrated it must be by men of technical knowledge, not politicians or benevolent minded men from the general public. The tendency of labour is toward arbitration but an arbitration which has a technical knowledge of the situation, to permanent trade boards in various industries. In the Garment Workers' trade there has been successful development toward that end. The last garment workers' strike in Chicago was occasioned first because of the low wages, and second, the continual unjust exactions of the local foreman. Then there was no opportunity for collective bargaining, no measure by which workers could get their complaints before the real owners and managers of the in-

dustry. Finally in one of the shops of the west side two or three girls went down to the office and after getting by the different employees they finally got into the sanctum sanctorum of the big man himself. He listened very patiently to their grievances and told them it must be remedied, and be remedied by the foreman concerned. Then he telephoned to the foreman that these things must be changed. But it was too late. Those girls were afraid to face the little petty tyrant who had been the occasion of their going to see the big man, and on the way back the strike started that affected afterwards one hundred thousand people. Now when the managers of that industry were told that these workers wanted an opportunity for collective bargaining they said it could not be done, that one simply could not devise any measure for permanent joint management in this trade. But inside of six months such a measure was devised which not only settled that strike but settled every other difficulty that arose in that garment workers' trade thereafter. And these same owners to-day are on record that they do not see how they ever got along without a permanent trade board to settle such disputes.

Of course there is the use of the Erdmann Act in transportation, but this was used only once in the first few years of its existence. Since 1908 it

has been used sixty times. When you once establish a railroad wage rate it extends over a whole system and it is absolutely maintained. All men are hired on that basis and that is one reason why that kind of arbitration is particularly successful in that industry. But when you come down to other industries that deal directly with the making of goods, the only real way out of continued disputes is to have a joint trade board on which the workers are adequately represented which can deal with grievances as they arise and before they reach the fighting stage. It is practically not an arbitration board but a conciliation board, a board of justice, the expression again of the democratic principle of collective bargaining. It is the first expression of it in the industrial world.

The public is tremendously interested in getting peace in industry but if the public wants to avoid industrial disputes then the public must care more for justice (very much more) than it cares for peace. And the emphasis must be put not on developing arbitration boards to try to settle wars after they have started, but on securing such proper conditions in industry as will remove the causes of war. If the public had been interested in seeing that the labour laws in Colorado were kept and that conditions were right in the Calumet mines the public would not

have had to worry itself so much about the situation that later developed, and until we, the third party to this situation, care a great deal more than we now care about securing proper and just conditions in industry we shall continually have to bear the burdens of recurrent industrial disputes.

LIMITATION OF OUTPUT

The charge is made that the trade union cripples the efficiency of individuals and limits total production. But we must remember that this charge lies also against capital, for capital limits production, shuts down to hold up prices, closes out factories altogether to maintain a monopoly, and has even been known to destroy goods in order to hold up prices. The trouble is that as long as men are running industry for profit and other men are working for profit each group is going to endeavour at times to limit output in order to hold its own self-interest; your charge here, your fundamental unethical condition, inheres not in either group but in the very nature of the present organisation of industry. Now labour limits production by limiting the hours of work and objecting to the use of machines. It advances again the contention that these are necessary defence measures, that it must defend the employee against destruction

from overwork and low wages. And the facts justify labour's contention. There are only three defences of labour against the pace-maker, against the speeding-up process, against a misguided efficiency that is seeking only short times results in immediate production and is not properly aware of the dangerous long times results in the lives of the worker. One is the good will of the human employer; the second, protective legislation; and the third, labour's own organised power and its own measures. The life of the worker must not be used up in the mere making of goods. That is a secondary thing. It must be made subordinate to the protection and development of the life of the worker out of which society itself exists. The sin of limiting production (if there be a sin), inheres in both sides. It is unethical to destroy both a man and his work and it is unethical to require of a man less than his best work. It is destructive of the very soul of a man that he should put into his work something less than the best, for a man only grows at his work unto the full stature of manhood as he puts the very best that is in him into the work that he is trying to do. Now when you come to limit a man's work, whether or not it will be morally destructive of the man depends upon the motive for which it is limited. If it is limited for social needs, to protect the group

from destruction, it is ethical rather than unethical. The trouble is, of course, that when men are taught that production must be limited (individual production for the good of the whole, as a necessary defence measure) that develops shirking and loafing. It is simply one evidence again of the moral degeneracy that follows after a war and war measures. As long as you have got a warfare here between the making of profits and the protection of the workers you are bound to have some moral degeneration follow that warfare on the side of both of the participants.

And what about the effects on society as a whole? We are living under a system of production that has been blindly carried forward. I go into one community and find thousands out of work and in another community find factories working night and day. What we have here is simply an absolutely blind and unintelligent system of production. Over-production under that system means unemployment and low wages and it means burdens thrown upon the whole community. Of course if we had the practical knowledge and ethical sense to organise industry co-ordinately, to satisfy our needs, we would not have over-production and limitation of output. But until that day comes labour must protect itself, and in doing that it is to a certain extent protecting the whole community from the results

of the blind process which simply drives on until it destroys both the ethical sense and the physical power of the worker.

What we have to do in the present situation is to strike a mean between the killing of time and the killing of men, between the loafing of labour and the driving of capital. And while we are attempting to find that mean, we have also got to move on to that better day when we shall organise production intelligently and ethically, that day when

> "No one shall work for money,
> And no one shall work for fame,
> But each for the joy of working," . . .

Towards the coming of that great day organised labour is a potent force. When that day comes we shall not need trade unions and their policy, but until it does come we need them very badly.

Q. The speaker spoke about the interest of the third party, the public, in strikes. Inasmuch as the public is divided up into about 10 per cent. capitalists and 90 per cent. workers, is it not a mistake to speak about the public as a third party?

A. The classification is not quite correct. You have five groups of the gainfully employed which comprise practically your public, but even some of your capitalists are workers. In these groups of the gainfully employed the largest single group is the agricultural workers, about eleven millions, and then you have got your professional workers, and then you have got your domestic workers, so that what you have in your industrial disputes to-day is only about twelve million, about 7 per cent. of the public.

Q. Does the speaker believe that the principle of the American Federation of Labor, the division of interest between capital and labour, is an economic fallacy?

A. I will endeavour to answer that question to-morrow.

Q. Did not the act of the McNamaras prove the inefficiency of the trade union to cope with the ever increasing power of the capitalist?

A. I think it proved rather the barbarity of the attitude of a certain group of capitalists in

this country towards the efforts of labour to find a way out. It was an act of desperation; it was the rat in the corner. It did to a certain extent show that the trade union had its limit, but that was only a part of the proof.

Q. In a year's time the labour agent handles seventy-five disputes but no strike occurs, and at the end of the year's time he can show that his five hundred men are earning $500 more. Do you know of any better method than that of the labour agent to settle disputes?

A. This is the best method under the present system of production if it is incorporated in the trade agreement but it depends a good deal on the personality of the business agent.

Q. Do you justify the closed shop on the ground of efficiency or on the ground of ethics?

A. In regard to efficiency I think the predominant testimony of the manufacturers themselves in the highly organised trades proves that it is more efficient; otherwise I am quite sure they would not go into the agreement and under the present system it is more profitable to them. On ethical grounds when you are dealing with the closed shop under coercive methods it is not ethical. No war methods are ethical. But when you get a shop which is practically a closed shop, where there are all union men working but where the door has not been shut by an arbitrary act

of coercion, where the shop is practically closed but it does not deny the right of employment to any man, you have a highly ethical situation.

Q. Do you prefer the preferential shop?

A. In certain situations.

Q. Is there any tendency on the part of organised labour to organise men without trades?

A. The lecture on Thursday will answer that.

Q. Do you think that industrial democracy will precede or follow political democracy?

A. The demand for industrial democracy rises out of the realisation of the right of political democracy.

Q. What is the use of giving workers industrial democracy if they have not political democracy?

A. They are mutually independent but develop side by side. I do not think that question is practically before us. We now have a certain amount of political democracy.

Q. What is the objection to the Compulsory Arbitration Act?

A. The objection of labour to the Compulsory Arbitration Act, and also to the Canadian one, which requires publicity and notification for thirty days, and prohibits a strike or lockout during that time, is that they apply unequally to capital and labour; that capital can avoid the consequences of such a law and its actual restric-

tions which labour cannot do. It cannot call a strike and labour is placed at a disadvantage because capital can practically shut down and discharge men. Labour finds itself beaten under the enforcement of that act.

Q. Take an employer that puts in a new machine and the man that runs the machine is paid $1.50 a day where the man that did the work before was paid $4.50. Do you think he is justified in putting in a machine that can only cheapen the cost of labour without adding to the efficiency of men or bettering the work?

A. Under the ethics of our present profit making system, of course, he is justified. Socially speaking, for it is a social responsibility that we can't lay on an individual person, we can't allow that thing to be done.

Q. What good does it do to strike? Since 1906 wages have gone up but necessities have gone up too.

A. Quite true, but if you had not had the efforts of unions you would have a greater disparity.

Q. Of what benefit is it to the employer to employ union labour, and how does the labour union prove that union labour is of benefit to the employer?

A. In this city I know of one case where the agent of a certain union showed employers in a

certain trade that they were making for their own destruction by the employment of men improperly qualified to do the work, and were inaugurating a cut-throat competition. That is only one case.

II. SOCIALISM

We are considering to-day simply one aspect of Socialism, taking it merely as the political expression of the labour movement, the attempt on the part of the working class to achieve their industrial ideals through political action. For Socialism claims to be, of course, the working class programme in the political field. The first question is, To what extent is this claim justified? Is Socialism really the programme of the working class? The Communist Manifesto, which was the declaration of independence of the Socialist state, uttered the thrilling slogan, "Workers of the World, unite. You have nothing to lose but your chains." The appeal then came from outside the producing group. To what extent has it been answered by the working class?

WORKING CLASS PROGRAM

It is a definite attempt to create a working-class consciousness, to develop self-realisation and self-expression on the part of the producers.

But the Socialist should not be allowed to suffer under the imputation of attempting to

create class hatred. No intelligent Socialist endeavours to stir up class hatred. Of course the doctrine of class consciousness preached by ignorant men unfamiliar with Socialist philosophy may, and undoubtedly does, have a result neither intended nor desired by the makers of the Socialist programme. There is, however, more danger of class hatred and class opposition being stirred up by those who would put the whole blame for social conditions upon individual malefactors, for if that doctrine ever gets hold of the working class of this or any other country the tendency will be to reach these individual malefactors and the class to which they belong with punishment.

The real object of developing class consciousness, the real object of the intelligent leaders of the Socialist movement, is to secure the abolition of all classes, to get the working class to be so conscious of the disabilities under which they suffer through the class division of society that they will not only redeem themselves but redeem society forever from any such condition. To what extent has there developed a genuine working class, that is, a self-conscious working class? It is impossible to make an economic grouping here. That attempt of early Socialism has of necessity been abandoned. There is no such rapid division of society into capitalist and pro-

letariat as early Socialism foretold. There is no such abolition, economically speaking, of the middle class as was forecast by early Socialists.

Economic groups, that is divisions according to income, tend more and more to merge. The wage earner becomes through the investment of his saving (the higher class of wage earner) more or less of a small capitalist. It is impossible to divide the working class from the capitalist class to-day simply on the grounds of pure income and economic self-interest. The working class to-day instead of being simply an economic group is an ethical and psychological group. It is a group that thinks in certain terms and has certain ideals rather than a group which has a certain amount of income, rather than a group which is a wage earning group as opposed to a capitalist, investing group entirely.

The leading Socialists are telling us that the working class is all those who live entirely by their own labour, and then they face the economic fact that I have just referred to, that many who live entirely by their own labour are nevertheless investing some of their surplus funds against the future. And so they say the working class to-day is all those who live entirely or principally by their own labour. But that does not appear to be an adequate standard of classification.

What about the folks who find themselves under our inheritance system living entirely off the labour of others and who yet come to see that that is unethical, who find themselves in a position that they wish to disown and yet if they should abandon that position and come down into the economic producing group they would increase competition and tend to make conditions harder for the group below. They reject the principle under which they are living but are yet endeavouring to the best of their ability so to shape their conduct as to change the whole situation. Now there are only a few of these people but they belong with the working class. They believe in the working class ideals and they endeavour to live by them. And so we ought to say that the working class to-day are those who believe in so organising life that all shall produce for the good of society, that none shall take anything which they do not create, in value that is, of course.

To what extent has the working class ideal captured the labour movement in this country? Of course, there has been a mistaken warfare back and forth between the leaders of the trade union movement and certain of the Socialists, which warfare did not exist, and does not exist, in Europe to any such extent as here. The Socialist movement has had to face the folly of

some of its defects and has had the bitter opposition of most of the leaders of the trade union movement in this country. The result is that the Socialist group in the American Federation of Labor has been able in the last few years to show about one-third of the total vote, and there they stand. But that does not represent their strength in the labour movement of this country. You have other evidences within the labour movement. They have affected it very seriously and have modified the attitude of the trade union leaders in this country toward political action. Early trade unions in this country absolutely disclaimed political action. Under the impetus of the Socialist movement this position has been abandoned and the American Federation of Labor now takes a political attitude. They will support those men who stand for their programme politically, and they will at times oppose those who do not stand for it. They will, of course, support trade union men for public office. The evidence of a still further development is the fact that the Washington Federation of Labor (that is the State of Washington on the Pacific Coast) has come out absolutely in favour not only of candidates who will stand for the platform of the labour union but for working class candidates.

There are other evidences of the extent to

which the Socialist movement is spreading through the American labour movement. The fact is that within the American Federation of Labor you can find evidences of working class action in the industrial field on the part of those who disavow the political movement. Both in the Chicago and San Francisco labour bodies there have been notable and historic discussions over which took priority in the case of industrial disputes, labour's obligations to labour or labour's obligations to capital; that is, in the event of a strike in a certain trade should the allied trades keep their contracts with capital or should they break them, holding more sacred and prior their obligations to fellow labourers. It is interesting to note in that discussion and fight that prominent Socialist leaders, men of national weight and standing, opposed violation of contract, opposed working class action in the industrial field to the disregard of its obligation to capital; while, on the other hand, men who advocated this policy were men who were bitter opponents of the Socialist political programme and action.

The Socialist movement purposes in its political action first to realise the immediate demands of the trade union movement. It purposes to secure them by legislation, as being a quicker and a more general process, as being a process

which will achieve the results over a larger territory in quicker time and will secure support to that end from the capitalist group. In that endeavour, the Socialists point out the fact that other allied forces can be enlisted. They are seeking abolition of child labour, the protection of women in industry, and proper liberty of action for organised labour under the law,— the immediate things which organised labour is itself fighting for. It may be interesting to note that the American Federation of Labor at its last session took a distinctly reactionary step in this matter and opposed the endeavour to secure the eight hour day by legislation.

Of course the attempt at political action does enlist other allied forces. For example, the Federated Council of Churches in this country, representing some thirty denominations, of seventeen million people, are on record as being willing to support legislative measures embodying these just demands of labour for proper protection and relief from over-work; and by the same token, the organised social workers in this country are on record to the same effect, so that you have these groups that can be allied along with the labour group to secure legislation for its immediate advance.

The Socialist political programme goes very much further than that. It is not content to

accept these measures for the immediate improvement of labour as a compromise. They are to be simply steps to far more significant measures, for Socialism demands not only the improvement of improper industrial conditions but the reconstruction of the whole industrial system around a totally different principle. It requires the abolition of the private ownership of the means of production and distribution through collective ownership and through democratic management. It requires the abolition of the wage system and the process by which the surplus value created by the worker is automatically appropriated by the capitalist group. It requires the organisation of industry around the principle of service instead of around the principle of gain. It demands that goods shall be made for use and not for profit. This is, of course, not a change in the form of organisation but in the very spirit and nature of the whole industrial procedure, and it demands correspondingly a similar change in the whole social organisation.

Here you have a significant event in the world's history. Here you have the attempt to organise both industry and society around the ideals of the worker instead of around the ideals of the thinker and the fighter. Here you have a group, which has never before expressed itself

in history, coming on to the stage of action, and it is the group of greatest number, it is the group of greatest power — when its power is once developed and realised. Such a movement could only be possible under democracy; such a programme to realise such a hope could only be realised, could only be expressed under a democratic system of government. But under that system such expression is inevitable. For the first time in history the manual worker, the industrial worker, has been given a stake in the commonwealth, has been given place and opportunity in determining the government. For the first time in history, that same worker has been educated, has been taught to read, has been taught to think; therefore, for the first time in history his capacities for action have been developed, and now those capacities for action are going to express themselves. Nothing can stop that. The world is not going back from its gains in democratic government and universal education. And that being the case, it is inevitable that this great group of power, which in past ages has been simply the mud-sill over which other folk walked to comfort and climbed to power, which all through history has been at the bottom of the social structure, shall now stand upon its feet and take its appointed place in the destinies of the race.

Now for those who believe in the ethics of Christianity, it ought to be pointed out that one of the great forces that have created both democracy and popular education and have made this movement for the development of the working class possible has been the force of the principles which are embodied in the teachings of Jesus. In those teachings there sounded for the first time in history, with a voice of universal authority, and with absolute clearness the long-cherished but long-unexpressed desires and hopes of the workers of all the ages. There spoke a worker, not a ruler, not an exploiter. There spoke one who worked with his hands and so came close to the heart of the great bulk of the human race, and also, in so doing, came close to the very heart of the Eternal.

THE INDICTMENT OF CAPITALISM

To what extent does this programme which the working class are forming — and remember that it is in the making, it is not formed yet — to what extent does this programme involve an indictment of capitalism; and the strongest part of the Socialist propaganda in this country has been its indictment of capitalism. It is not an indictment of the capitalist; that needs to be understood. That indictment needs to be made sometimes but the Socialists are quite willing to

leave that to the law as at present made and administered. I think at times that the law needs to get a little speeding up process in that direction. I think, for example, that the men who have recently been speculating in the hunger of the race have put themselves beyond the pale even of decent capitalist ethics. But the Socialist is not concerned with indicting individual capitalists. He believes that they as much as anyone else are victims of the system. His indictment is against the whole system of industry as organised on the capitalist basis.

First we want to understand that the Socialist does not simply want to abolish individual ownership of the means of production and distribution of the sources of wealth. His contention is not simply against individual ownership which, of course, centres the resources upon which the whole of life depends into a few hands. Against such individualistic ownership you might put the term collectivism, and you could have collectivism without Socialism. You might have a form of state ownership which would abolish individual ownership of the means of production and distribution but which would be nothing else but state capitalism. Not a little of the state Socialism of Europe is nothing other than state capitalism, both ownership and the capitalistic principle being transferred to the state collectively.

Something more is involved in capitalism than individual ownership of the means of life. It is the carrying on of industry for the mere piling up of economic wealth, for the mere increase of capital, the mere making of goods — for the sake of having goods and getting profit out of them. That is the fundamental sin in the capitalist organisation of industry. The development of human life, the great, vital interests of human welfare are made secondary to the production of goods. The increase of capital is the goal of the system.

Now what indictment does Socialism bring against such a system of the carrying on of industry, the making of goods for the sake of profit and increase of wealth rather than that goods should serve human life and develop the highest values of human life? And Socialism is not alone in its indictment of capital. If you will read what Professor Brooks Adams, of this city, says in his "Theory of Social Revolutions," you will find as severe an indictment of the efficiency of the capitalist system of industry as could have been penned. If you will read "Between Eras" by Professor Small of the University of Chicago, you will find a most scathing moral indictment of capitalism, and both of these come from non-socialist sources. The burden of their testimony is, that while capitalism has ful-

filled a necessary part in human development, and while its contribution to the human race has been extremely significant, while we are all indebted to it for many things, it has now become an outworn process, inadequate to meet the needs of the present; that it is like one of its old machines that needs to be put in the scrap heap, to give place to a more intelligent and more efficient method of doing the world's work.

Now it would be well for us, big capitalists and small capitalists, middle-class, professional men and workers, if we could look at that testimony dispassionately, considering it as an indictment of a system and not of persons; if we could separate the personal element and face that situation on economic and ethical grounds, on the basis of industrial and social efficiency. For that is the part of the indictment, that the capitalist system no longer fulfils its own cherished ideal of efficiency; that it is no longer adequate to do the work of the world properly; that under its competitive organisation we are securing a break-down both in the process of production and the process of distribution; that production is not adequately handled to meet the needs of the world to-day; that we have continued cycles of prosperity and depression, of overproduction and under-production, of good times and hard times, of panics with all that they infer

in unemployment and uncertainty, even to the capitalist group.

The evidence for that of course lies with economists, but the man in the street can see how the system practically breaks down, especially if he be a man who travels about the country. He will find in one place an abundance of goods, in another place a scarcity, in one place over-employment and in another under-employment. He will find the produce of the fields and orchards rotting on the ground and being thrown into the sea at the ports in some sections, and in other places he will find folks going hungry and still others finding their incomes pressing ever closer on the high cost of living. He will see the enormous waste involved in the present anarchistic method of distribution.

Some one with a brain for figures and an imagination has computed that the total waste of our present method of doing industry and business amounts to six thousand dollars a year for every family in the United States. That may be rather high but there is enough waste going on to relieve all the hardship of the world. In the face of a surplus production of food stuffs taking the world over, in spite of the fact that we have produced one and a half times more food than will feed the world in comfort, we have whole races living on the verge of starvation. That is

an indication that our present method of production and distribution is no longer adequate, that it is not measuring up to the present intellectual progress of the race. For the fact that we realise the inefficiency shows that we have sufficient intellectual capacity now to meet the situation. To-day by social knowledge socially acquired and social labour socially exercised, we conquer nature, in both the products of the soil and in disease, and still millions starve and die. To-day by social knowledge socially acquired and socially exercised we avert the disasters of the waters and the disasters of contagion and still we have our thousands stalking up and down our streets in unemployment. If you need any more testimony than mine and that of thousands of others concerning the inefficiency of the capitalistic system of industry to meet the needs of this modern world, take the testimony of one of its own high priests. Certainly the head of the steel trust in this country is entitled to speak with respect on this question and the most significant thing I have seen in the American press in the last few years was Mr. Gary's admission when he faced the situation of unemployment in New York as chairman of the committee there, that the whole unemployment situation in this country was an evidence of bad management. It is a social gain to have that admission.

But when you come to face the moral situation, the question is more significant still. There are both economists and industrial leaders who tell us that the present inefficiency of the capitalistic system is not due to any inherent defect, but simply due to some minor mal-adjustments, that the machine can still be cranked up and made to run to meet the needs of the race. That will depend upon whether there is any fundamental moral quality lacking, for you need something more than efficiency and science to meet the needs of this modern world. You cannot organise the business of the world to-day to meet the demands of the intellect and the consciousness of the modern world unless you have certain moral qualities in your system to begin with. And the severest indictment against the capitalistic system is on moral grounds. We must all admit that certain moral qualities have been developed and strengthened in the business and industrial world by the capitalist methods of management, that we have developed in certain aspects mutual faith and trust and dependency. We have developed a certain amount of reliance upon men's words, of co-operation up to a certain point but over against that you have to put other factors. You have to put the revelations that have been made in court after court and to commission after commission in the last twenty-five years of

the extreme corruption in the order of the present business world, due to all kinds of graft, due to the drive of the profit motive, so that men who would be perfectly honest man to man, whose word man to man would be as good as their bond any day (and that is a social gain due to capitalism), men of whom that could be said, would yet corrupt their fellow men and plunder the common people remorselessly. Evidences of the corruption of departments of the United States government, evidences of an organised plan subtly to control Congress and the courts, evidence of wholesale attempts to disrupt the labour movement by bribery and corruption — these are not charges but proven facts that lie at the door of capitalism to-day.

And after that, its reckless waste of human life; and after its reckless waste of human life in the making of goods, its reckless destruction of the moral nature of man, its exhaustion of the spiritual energies of whole groups of men by industry carried to the point of fatigue, by industry failing to furnish even the proper means for physical nourishment and so leaving life depleted and almost helpless! You have only to read the testimony of the investigators in Pittsburgh and other steel towns to see what the most perfect capitalistic machine has done in the

waste of the physical and moral resources of whole groups of the population.

After that tale has been told there lies the other story, and that is the tale of the stirring of the spirit of hatred and bitterness and passion and resentment that comes as men become aware of this process. And you simply have all the hate and hell of war transferred from militarism over into the industrial system as long as it is run by capital alone for the gains that chiefly come to capital. And that is the end of the story, because when you have capitalism in its finest form, when it is honest and pure and good it still leaves an unanswerable moral question in the consciousness of those same good people. Read what Small puts into the lips of the college girl who finds herself inheriting a great fortune but cannot understand what moral right she has to it and how she shall use it to meet the question of injustice that lies in her mind. That question lies at the very heart of the system and is being faced to-day by folks who are beyond reproach in the circles of capitalism.

And for that question capitalism itself has no answer. I took up my morning paper and I read that after the management of the New Haven Railroad has looted New England to the limit, because the loot has been distributed into inno-

cent hands, nothing can be done. The Commission says nothing can be done concerning it and the papers say nothing can be done because they approach it with the capitalistic mind. But when you approach it from the mind which does not insist upon the maintenance of the capitalistic system of industry you ask why the people who have got the major part of the loot — who have got the money that innocent investors paid to them — you ask why they cannot be reached and the unholy tribute returned back to the public again. Of course if New England is going to contribute perpetually a tax upon the life and labour of its people to the estates of great financiers, why nothing can be done. And then to justify such a system men blasphemously have talked about some of the most sacred teachings of the Christian religion, being quite willing that others should bear the burden for their sins perpetually.

COLLECTIVE OWNERSHIP

Now to remedy this condition Socialism proposes collective ownership. The later Socialists admit that there are many forms of industry which must still remain in private hands for a long time to come. If you ask what it means that the people should collectively own and administer those things upon which the people

depend, they will tell you it means taking over immediately the means of transportation and communication and then some of the great monopolies. They are willing to leave the rest to natural and lawful social development. They insist that we face a great world-wide movement here that never reverses itself, that we continue to extend our collective administration all over the country, to the taking over of the Alaskan railways and mines. The point is not to worry about where to stop but to seize upon the next step, according to your modern philosopher-Socialist.

Is that a panacea? Will it do what Socialism wants done? Will it restore to the people the whole product of their labour? Will not simple collectivism be merely another form of capitalism, with labour required to produce the unearned increment for those who hold the underlying securities? Will it relieve the moral aspect of the situation or are we face to face here with something that is deeper than any form of industrial organisation, that lies rather in human nature than in any principle of social organisation? Are we face to face here with something which cannot be met by any change in the social organisation? You might have state capitalism, or even the absolute co-operative ownership of the means of life with all the results of the com-

mon labour accruing to the people, and if the motive was simply production of goods your moral distress would be just the same as now, because your fundamental principle would not have been changed. The fundamental evil is taking and using and producing goods for the mere sake of material gain and material pleasure, and unless you can eliminate that you simply face moral disaster under any system that the world can devise. Organise collectively and co-operatively and you put the balance on the side of labour's ideal, but you do not automatically secure it. You simply put the weight on the side of man's idealism, on the side of his spiritual nature. You cannot automatically produce the great ideals men have longed for through all the ages.

In addition to collective ownership you need two other things. The first is, a spiritual conception — an idealistic conception — of property, so that property shall be seen to be sacred, not because somebody happens to own it and their right must be protected, but because on the one hand it embodies the great energies of man and the great energies of the Divine which have gone into its production, and because on the other hand it can contribute to the highest development of man and be made the servant of his spiritual capacities. Along with that you

must have the spirit and ideal of service so that men will bend their necks beneath the yoke of toil, the common burden of the world's work, neither for their own honour nor comfort, but will perform their due part in the work of the world as servants of the common good. Without that spirit of service, without that devotion to the ideal which belongs to the artists and to the prophets and to the martyrs, and which now becomes the sacred right and the divine heritage of the common toilers, without that your co-operative commonwealth will be a vain delusion. But with that your co-operative commonwealth is identical with the Kingdom of God which Jesus taught.

Q. In the interim of the socialistic ideal what would the speaker do if he were left a million dollars?

A. I would try to rid myself of the incumbrance as quickly as possible, but I would do it, as one of our American millionaires said, to the best of my judgment to destroy the system under which it was made.

Q. In what way does the programme of modern Socialism differ from the Marxian programme?

A. The modern Socialist is much more of a philosopher than Marx was. Taking him in the group he is not so much of a materialist or fatalist. He believes much more than Marx did in the conscious working out of the social goal.

Q. You said you must separate the personal question from the impersonal one. How can there be a moral question involved if the personal element is not predominant?

A. There are group moral questions in which persons are involved for which no person is or can be alone responsible. He is responsible for his part toward the changing of any system that he regards as unethical, and that is as far as his responsibility goes, and you cannot hold him for not breaking away from a condition he cannot control.

Q. Why do not those who claim to be sympathetic to Socialism and support it with their money come out plainly and say they are Socialists?

A. I should think that if there is any truth in the phrase, "Money talks," that is what they are doing.

Q. Is not such an industry as the Ford a good illustration of absolute co-operation along Socialist lines?

A. I shall deal with the question of profit sharing in a later lecture.

Q. The claim is made that Socialism only appeals to manual labour and not to intellectual. Is this so?

A. While regretting the fact, I have not yet found any way of getting intelligence into the heads of some people. It simply cannot be done. Socialism has never made that distinction which some of its opponents have put into its mouth. It recognises the contribution of all groups of active workers toward social progress.

Q. Why is it that Christianity is monopolised by capitalists, at least, very few churches oppose the capitalistic system.

A. Because the significance of Jesus' teaching on property was obscured for a great proportion of Christians by Roman and Grecian influences in the early development of Christian-

ity and turned into theological and doctrinal channels. It is getting out of them now.

Q. Is only manual labour recognised by the Socialist?

A. The Socialist recognises all kinds of labour that contributes to social progress and social development.

Q. Have the arguments against Socialism based upon religion any foundation?

A. There have been individual Socialists who were very bitter antagonists of organised religion. Aside from that these attacks have no logical and no ethical basis.

Q. Does Socialism tend to destroy the family?

A. That is another of those ancient lies that still linger. The only basis for it is that some individual Socialists have been opposed to the family in its present form, but Socialism as a whole makes for the purification and freedom of the family.

Q. Under Socialism would not social service be more efficient and more in keeping than under the present system of capitalism?

A. One of the greatest crimes and charges that lie at the door of the present industrial system is that it makes men worse than they naturally would be because they are compelled to produce dividends.

Q. If the Socialists would have the government take over the means of transportation and communication what becomes of the other workers?

A. I expect they would want to get their turn as soon as they could.

Q. How can you reconcile the doctrine of economic determinism and freedom of the will?

A. Because it shows man where to apply his spiritual powers, namely, to the transformation of the economic system.

Q. In view of the inefficiency now going on in some public departments how can you assure us that greater efficiency will result from Socialism?

A. We shall have to stand some inefficiency. That is part of the price of progress. I would rather have some kinds of inefficiency than others, and I would rather have my mail a little late and know that no mail carrier is working over time. As we gain in social capacity inefficiency disappears.

Q. Instead of taking over only the means of transportation and communication would not it be just as easy to take over everything? In other words would it not be just as easy to take a whole loaf as half?

A. It is just as easy to stand for a great deal

more, but the point is you can practically proceed only in one way, and that is gain your social efficiency as you go along.

Q. Will you give the names of one or two of the best books on the subject of labour?

A. "American Trade Unions," by Marot; "History and Problems of Organised Labor," by Carleton, a sympathetic study from the outside.

Q. Will you please give the names of some books on Socialism?

A. "History of Socialism," the revised edition; "Facts of Socialism," by Hughan, and the "Spiritual Significance of Socialism," by Spargo.

III. SYNDICALISM

THE latest development in the labour movement is Syndicalism. It comes from France, that supreme mother of revolutions. In France it appears to have spent its force. It is still strong in the other Latin countries of Europe, perhaps because of the temperament of the people and perhaps because of the backward state of industry in those countries. The name originally meant nothing more than trade unionism, but recently, in the last twenty years, it has come to mean revolutionary unionism. One of its Socialist critics says that it comprises Socialist philososphy, united with anarchistic ideals and trade union weapons.

Syndicalism proposes to solidify the workers by industries, and to use all the weapons of trade unions to the utmost to accomplish an end which trade unions do not seek to accomplish — the transformation of the present industrial system and also of the present organisation of society. So far it agrees with socialism. But it parts company with socialism because it distrusts and disavows political methods, and will have nothing to do with the political state, pro-

posing to act purely in the economic field and to accomplish an industrial in the place of a political state.

It has developed a philosophy. On the practical side it is the refuge of those who have become disappointed and disillusioned, both in the Trade Union Movement and in the Socialist party. But it has gathered around it in Europe, a group of intellectuals who have expressed its point of view in a philosophy — the philosophy of pure intuition — claiming not a little support from Bergson, and teaching the working class to distrust the intellectuals, believing that the intuitions and desires of the workers themselves will lead to a much more effective programme than the plans of the theories of the thinkers. It claims, in the mouth of this group of philosophers, to be something more than a philosophy, to be a religion, because of the extent to which it masses together large numbers of men behind the ideal of a better and a higher life, and unites them behind that ideal with a passion for service to the extent of sacrifice.

INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM

Now before considering the American form of Syndicalism, it ought to be noted that there is a tendency in that direction inside the American Federation of Labor in this country. That

tendency goes under the head of Industrial Unionism, which is the organisation of the workers around the product instead of around the tool, following not craft lines but following the divisions which capital has made in the modern industrial process. To organise the workers by the industry instead of by the trade or the craft, would oppose to the concentration of capital the concentration of labour. It would avoid the weakening effect of jurisdictional disputes, which leaves labour fighting against itself in certain industries in times of strike, which not only disgusts the general public but which also weakens craft unionism. In some trades, there are rival organisations, each claiming to dominate the workers.

Industrial Unionism, however, has not always succeeded in avoiding jurisdictional disputes. Indeed, it has developed quite a few in organised labour. The two great groups organised industrially are the miners and the brewery workers. One of the latest jurisdictional fights arose out of the fact that owing to the success of the prohibition movement some of the breweries have gone into the business of producing mineral waters, and the brewery workers' union claimed jurisdiction over the men driving the mineral water wagons. This claim led to a conflict with the union of another trade, and incidentally

raised the question. "When is a brewery not a brewery?"

Besides, these industrial unions have an anarchistic tendency in the labour world because they have a frankly revolutionary aim and purpose; that is, they are not content to modify the existing system, but propose to transform it, — of course by political means, not by weapons and violence. That is very clear, both with the brewery workers and the miners. The preamble to the Constitution of the United Mine Workers sets forth that their goal is to secure for the workers the full social value of their product.

While they have this tendency, however, the industrial unions part company with the Syndicalists because they trust to political means. They are allied with the socialist group rather than with the group of the industrial workers organised for direct industrial action.

This group of industrial unionists has extended itself, and has influenced labour in other directions. In order to meet the demand the A. F. of L. has created departments, with the effort to amalgamate groups of trades. Concentration of trades has developed within those departments — in the metal trades it has proceeded to a very marked degree. There have been efforts made also in the direction of federation of unions, a most noted example being in

the railroad workers, where we have a federation of all mechanical workers to meet the federation of the lines themselves. It has also been proposed and sanctioned that there should be a federation of federations so as to meet the concentrated management of the railroads with the concentrated organisation of all the workers. This was attempted once before in this country, in 1894.

These tendencies within the American Federation of Labor all indicate that the type of labour union for the future will be the industrial type. There are two great forces working in that direction; one, the improvement of machinery which makes labour increasingly automatic and wipes out the old craftsman and therefore removes the necessity for the craft union; the other being the increased concentration of capital, and of the management of industry, which forces increasing solidarity of labour.

THE I. W. W.

The American expression of Syndicalism is the I. W. W., that feared, hated, misunderstood, misrepresented, and outlawed organisation. It is the stormy petrel of the American labour movement. Wherever there is any kind of a fight to be waged in behalf of the folks at the bottom, the I. W. W. is more than willing to wage it. When-

ever there are heads to be broken, its heads are cheerfully and gallantly offered. It has to endure to-day the same kind of obliquy, the same misrepresentation that attended trade unionism in its early days, and socialism in its beginning.

There is evidence beyond the shadow of a doubt that Syndicalism in Europe was started by the group of militant anarchists in France, who were persecuted by the police and mercilessly hunted down, they attempted in vain to establish relations with the socialist groups. Finding there was no possibility of opening up again that long warfare which had been waging in Europe between socialists and anarchists, they turned to the trade unions for refuge. They went into them and captured a section of them with their policies and their programme. In comparison with that, in this country the most militant and successful leader of the I. W. W. came out of that early strike in Colorado, 1903-4, when certain corporations appropriated for their own use both the civil and the military powers of the State, when their agents over-ruled the courts by force, and publicly consigned the Constitution to hell.

There are a lot of people interested in this country in repressing the I. W. W. They ought to note this fact, that the growth of the I. W. W. proceeds in direct ratio to the policy of repression. Whenever trade union organisa-

tion is denied by capital, the next move of labour is to seek political expression. Whenever trade union activity is limited there you will find socialism increasing its vote. Where political activity is not entered into, where it is checked or repressed, or wherever working folks are not naturalised, there you find industrial activity growing by leaps and bounds. Those folks who are trying to hold back the flood of discontent, might well remember what has happened in the past to those who attempted to do that thing by the mere policy of repression. They might, as they look around them, remember also what happens to people who try to sit too long on a safety valve.

The I. W. W. claims a membership of 120,000 members; it had a paid-up membership in 1913 of about 30,000. It proposes to organise the workers into one big union with certain national departments; operating in three fields at present,— textile workers, forest and lumber workers, marine and transportation workers. It has about ninety-five local unions scattered around, including farm workers and construction hands. It operates in the unskilled immigrant group at the bottom, and in the group of nomads created by the abnormal conditions of our seasonal trades. Besides this, it is the Cave of Adullam of the modern working world, to

which gather all those who find themselves outcast and many of those who believe themselves outlawed. It is the mouthpiece of discontent. It gathers to itself naturally the most radical among the Socialists. It has practically captured what was formerly the high-brow Socialist magazine of this country, if not for its organisation, at least for a pretty broad part of its policies and its programme.

The I. W. W. has a four-fold fight on its hands and whatever may be thought of the nature of its cause, the gallantry of its struggle against odds is worthy of a moment's admiration. Not content with finding itself arrayed against the organised forces of the community, not content with finding itself arrayed against the law, the pulpit and the press, it has forced a fight in the ranks of labour itself. For in the beginning it flung down the gauntlet before both the American Federation of Labor and the Socialist Party. That three-cornered warfare is being waged with bitterness and vituperation and with such epithets and invectives as would do credit even to theological disputes.

It ought to be said in passing, however, that the strength of the I. W. W. cannot be determined by its membership. It operates, you notice, among a group of workers many of whom do not stay in one place very long and do not

receive very much of an income and therefore do not always keep their cards properly paid up. Its strength may be more properly determined by the number of enemies it has made, and its strength will be determined in the long run not by the numbers it gathers together or the organising value of its ideals, but by the contribution it will leave upon the labour movement of the world in change of form and modification of policy.

The I. W. W. started out to challenge the craft union of this country. In Europe that challenge was not so direct. There Syndicalism started out under the old craft union but changed it. Here in America it proclaimed that craft organisation spelled for the worker division, defeat, and degeneration. Here it was a direct warfare. The preamble to the constitution of the I. W. W. points out three defects in the kind of union promoted by the American Federation of Labor: (1), that it does not offer effective resistance to the solidarity of capital; (2), it weakens labour by internal warfare because often in the ordinary strike and always in the jurisdictional strike labour finds itself fighting against itself; (3), it teaches the worker that the interest of the worker and the capitalist are identical and so leads the worker into submission.

To remedy the first two defects the I. W. W. propose to solidify all labour. They propose to hold the workers together by industries according to the product turned out and the work done. They propose to unite these groups in various industries in one big union with low fees to which all shall be welcome. And this great note of solidarity is the dominant note with which the industrial union proposes to replace the craft union. Here we have a note that needs to be heard. It is distinctly a voice for the group that is down below the skilled craft organisation with its benefits, down below the possibility of political action. The I. W. W. is the friend and the champion of the unskilled immigrant, the outcast and the outlaw, and if it has done nothing else it is at least performing a valuable social service in making the rest of us see the needs and conditions of this group at the bottom. In becoming the mouthpiece for them, that they may let the world know the conditions under which they work and live, obviously the only answer which any intelligent and just community can make to an attempt to repress the voice from the bottom, is to insist that that voice must be heard no matter what the terms of its speech, because only so can we find out what the facts are and what action to take in order to meet injustice if it exists.

Of course the ideal of solidarity is one of the great moving ideals of the race, one of the ideals which becomes a great force in the driving upward and onward of humanity, and I must confess that in the presence of that ideal I feel something of admiration of those folks at the bottom who, in the face of all the forces that are driving them apart, still would come together and hold up before the world one of the greatest ideals that the human mind has ever conceived. Those of us here who have been schooled at the feet of the Carpenter will recognise at once that this ideal of the solidarity of the human race is our ideal, and that some practical expression must be found for it, not merely in sentiment, not merely in emotion, but in the actual working world. I must confess to being moved at one little thing that occurred out here at the Lawrence strike beyond anything else that happened there. It was the group of immigrant women of many diverse nationalities, sitting around the common table to peel the potatoes for the common meal, and singing, in their varied tongues, as they did this necessary work, the great hymn of the working class of the world, with that chorus:

"'Tis the last great conflict,
Let each stand in his place,
The Industrial Union
(or the Brotherhood in the Workers, or

the Brotherhood of men — some of the
different phrases for it)
The Brotherhood of the Workers,
Shall be the human race."

Whatever the defects of the organisation, when it can take the people of narrow, contracted, ignorant lives, lift them up out of that narrowness, and that sordidness, lift them up, put them in touch with the great world of all humanity, and give them a vision and an ideal like that, it is performing a service to society that needs to be done.

Now when you come to the other part of the propaganda of the I. W. W. you have something very different. It stands out in clear distinction from the American Federation of Labor by its insistence of warfare between the worker and the employer. Its declaration of independence is a declaration of war. The preamble to its constitution says the working class and the employing class have nothing in common. There can be no peace as long as hunger and cold are found among the people. A few classes have all the good things of life. Between these two classes struggle must go on until the workers organise as a class, take possession of the machinery of production and abolish the wage system. It proposes to make war upon the enemy wherever and whenever he may be found. It will strike

whenever it can to advantage, and go back to work and strike again, whenever by striking it will gain anything for the working class. It will write no contracts with the employer because contracts at best mean a compromise and a form of truce, and it believes in unending warfare by all possible methods except the method of open violence. It declares that it will harass the employer by all possible means in its power in order to make gains for labour. Here, of course, you have the tactics of militarism, and the tactics of militarism always involve the ethics of militarism; and both the tactics and the ethics of militarism involve as serious consequences for those who use them as for those against whom they are employed.

This frankly revolutionary note in the I. W. W. propaganda that distinguishes it both from trade unionism and from Socialism, is based upon two propositions which are not absolutely sound. One is the proposition that all wealth belongs to the workers; because they made it. That of course depends upon how large is your definition of the worker. What we have here is a popular teaching of Marx' famous doctrine, that capital contributes nothing to the production of new goods, simply passes over its own exchange value. But the fallacy that lurks there, and is now being propagated all over this country, is the

failure to observe the difference between capital and the capitalists. The capitalist when he participates in the process of production, does contribute something to it. And therefore the wealth created in the world is not all created by folks working for wages. If you are going to predicate your tactics on the basis of fallacies, your tactics of course, will be fundamentally unjust.

The next fundamental fallacy here, or half-truth, is in the proposition that the working class and the employing class have nothing in common. It may be quite true that there is an economic fallacy underlying the proposition of the trade union that there is an identity of interest between the employing class and the employed, but it does not follow that they have nothing in common. There is a clear failure here to distinguish between the employer as an individual and the employer as a social institution in the capitalist system. If you are talking impersonally about employers, about capitalists as a social institution, it is of course a sound economic idea that there is absolute antagonism of interest between that impersonal employing group and the wage earning group, because one's economic interest is to increase goods and profit and to reduce labour cost, and the other's economic interest is to push up labour cost by every means

in its power, and you have a fundamental conflict there. But when you are talking about individual employers and individual wage earners they have a great many things in common.

They have not an ultimate common interest but they have a very large common interest in the present order of things. They have the common interest to make the present order of things as socially efficient as it can be made, pending a time when it can be changed. I do not concede that there is any absolute conflict of ideas here. I believe it is practically sound that the present order of things can be made as socially efficient as possible without relinquishing any desire to make a fundamental change in the existing order of things. It appears to be a social hope of honest men, men socially minded, to make the present machinery do the best work it is capable of doing while they are getting ready to make new machinery to take its place. Both the employer and employed have this in common,— both are suffering from a common imperfect system; both are suffering from the same evil. When any group of men of either section recognise that fact and are willing in all sincerity to take hold and try to remove the common evil, there is at once a common interest between that group of employers and employed, enduring so long as they work together for the

time when the present economic antagonism will be removed. This antagonism is a fact pressing hard upon all of us. We are all suffering from it in every walk of life — not simply the capitalist and the labourer, but the intelligent workers. And the day of redemption for us, the day of release, will be postponed by any propaganda making for hatred between man and man. The full answer to a declaration of war against individuals is the increase of class warfare. It must also be remembered that war is never stopped when one or the other side wins an absolute victory. This is not a victory, for nothing was ever settled in that way yet. It will have to be waged all over again.

The only possible way to find a day of release from the common evils that are oppressing all of us is to get the most of us together in the common cause, to get the great mass of workers and the more prominent members of society to join hands to remove the common imperfect system and the common immorality in our social organisation.

DIRECT ACTION

Labour's tactics in this Syndicalist warfare, in which it differs from Socialism, is "direct action." Here it breaks with Socialism; it says nothing of political action; it will have nothing to do with legislation. This it declares to be a

delusion; it leaves the worker distracted — he doesn't act. It wants direct action on his part in the economic field, instead of action through political means. Political action is diplomacy; direct action is war.

The term "direct action" can be applied legitimately to labour action in the industrial and economic field as against political action. As a matter of fact it comes to mean the radical tactics employed by the Syndicalists in Europe and the Industrial Workers of the World in this country. Those tactics may be summarised thus:

(1) General Strike.

(2) Sabotage.

The *General Strike* is advocated to bring about a condition in which society being paralysed, the industrial workers will have to come to its rescue. In preparation for the general strike all sorts of small strikes can be encouraged, and while the general strike does not involve violence, some syndicalist leaders have thought that it may be a good thing to advocate violence in the small strikes. What we have here is the re-appearance of an old ideal that has been seen time and time again in the labouring and industrial world. The writings of Syndicalists in Europe indicate that the general strike

is not so much a practical thing as a "myth." Sovel, the French leader, declares that there are from time to time certain pert ideas and ideals, or "myths" which are sources of social progress. When you come to actual development these myths have no full realisation in practical action. They do their work in firing the passions of men. The trouble is that this sort of idea is likely to remain but a myth when you come to try it out. In the first place no general strike on the part of the industrial workers would paralyse industry. There is something more to be reckoned with than the manufacturing process. There is the great farming process from which food must come; there is the great credit system on which the modern world depends. The general strike must include the whole to be successful.

If it can be accomplished without violence, which is an extremely unlikely thing, you would simply have transferred the ownership of industrial property from one class to another. You would not have settled the fundamental root of the difficulty, which is the social institution of property. That is the root of the whole industrial question, and that cannot be settled by one group. It can only be settled by a common agreement on the part of the people as a whole.

SABOTAGE

Sabotage means the carrying out of "direct action" by interference with the industrial process. It comes from a French word meaning work clumsily done. The first appearance of it in a general policy was following a strike in Scotland, where some dock labourers struck for shorter hours and higher wages. The strike was defeated by the introduction of farm labourers as strike breakers. After the men went back to work in their old places the leaders got them together and said: "You can do your work as poorly as those fellows who took your places." They went back to work to shirk their jobs and in a little while they got their increased pay on condition of doing better work.

The primary form of sabotage is this: instead of giving a good piece of work for a poor day's pay, its advocates said, "We will give a poor day's work in return for a poor day's pay." The French have resolved this into a philosophy of sabotage, with such refinements as are typical of the French mind. They have developed many curious forms of sabotage: carrying out literally the multitude of orders on a railroad and so confusing traffic; changing the labels on freight; the strike of the open mouth,— by telling customers the actual facts about the goods they are about

to purchase, and last of all, the Malthusian strike to limit the birthrate and lessen the supply of industrial workers. In this country the advocates of sabotage state that it means any interference with industry with the purpose of limiting output, or injuring the employer for the benefit of the worker, provided no other means are available. Violence is not countenanced or taught by advocates of sabotage. They are more interested in getting ready the minds of the workers in preparation of the general strike than in the actual process of industry. They recognise it is a dangerous weapon to use, dangerous in more ways than one. Socialists have disavowed it. In this country they have adopted a resolution that any member teaching sabotage or any form of crime as a means for the emancipation of the working class, shall be expelled. This has been adopted not on grounds of the consequences to capital, but on grounds of the consequences to labour, because the history of labour shows that the use of that weapon — and it is an old weapon — being double-edged, hurts labour just as much as it does capital; that it brings distrust, breaks down morality, breaks down solidarity, and comes even to be used within labour circles for personal and factional ends. It is on these grounds that the Socialist groups have disavowed it. The most prominent

American Syndicalist was recently recalled from membership in the Socialist National Committee for advocating sabotage.

Some Syndicalist leaders attempt to establish the ethical validity of sabotage. They are not restrained by the ethics that cling around private property for its protection. You remember that there was some sabotage in Boston Harbor some time ago and the ethical question depends on whose ox is being gored. The thesis is that when the industrial worker does an act which may be destructive for the sake of the social good, it is not necessarily harmful. That is your old familiar doctrine that the end justifies the means; it is the old familiar doctrine of doing evil that good may come of it, and history has proved that those who use a means which they question to accomplish an end, in the long run defeat their own end and absolutely destroy their own capacity for reaching that end.

Syndicalism gives us this gain. It attempts to put before us the great ideal of solidarity and shows us the necessity for it. It says that a state in which political bureaucracy was set over industry would be intolerable and insufferable, and it does rightly call our attention to the necessity of some simpler form of social organisation and control in the industrial field. But in its tactics it defeats itself and it seeks what is

impossible in social progress, a short cut to an ideal which all just men will recognise as one of the great and desirable ideals of the race.

If men are going to do what Syndicalism says it is doing, or wants to do,— prepare workers in the industrial field to be able to take their part in the development of the race, prepare the new society (and even the Socialists admit that much education remains to be done before wide-spread collectivism is possible) then what they have to do is not to teach warfare, not to develop anarchistic methods which will disturb the labour process; what they have to do is to develop social efficiency on the part of the group at the bottom of society, and that is a task which the whole community must face in answer to this challenge from the industrial group at the bottom.

Q. Is the solidarity ideal of the I. W. W. a product of necessity or of free choice?

A. It is a combination of both. The concentration of modern industry and the organisation of the skilled workers, have both been pressing upon the group at the bottom; but it is more than that, it is the stirring up of an ideal in human history. This is one of the modern expressions of it.

Q. What method might be used in the case of the industrial organisation to get results in regard to individual efficiency of the worker which is not now set them by trade unions?

A. In my observation of many forms of work, the most effective procedure to secure the largest amount of efficiency on the part of the individual worker, is to enable him to get the results of his work.

Q. Does not philosophic anarchism seek to develop the individual, physically, morally, spiritually and mentally?

A. That is undoubtedly its purpose and its plan. The question remains whether its end can be accomplished without a very large degree of community action to the same end.

Q. What is the difference between the Chicago branch of the I. W. W. and the Detroit faction?

A. The Detroit faction believes in more con-

servative methods and in political action while the Chicago faction believes in radical methods in the industrial field. Of course the Detroit faction is the much smaller group.

Q. If open warfare or sabotage is not acceptable to Christian ethics what would you advocate for the unskilled worker who belongs to the I. W. W. if he did not get enough wages? What would you advise him to do?

A. I do not see that he betters his position materially by sabotage. I do not see that he is able effectively to strike while on the job; his only weapon that is effective now is that of the actual strike.

Q. Are not the Syndicalists and the industrial trade unionists all members of one group?

A. There are many different groups. There are some trade unionists who will co-operate, there are others who will not, and the tendency in this country just now is toward dissension.

Q. Is the doctrine of sabotage ethically justifiable?

A. I think I answered that question in the last of my speech. No action is ethically justifiable which results in a larger social injury. And taking the whole social effects of sabotage upon the world as well as upon the employer it is injurious. And it is unethical because of this.

Q. Dare we trust this outlawed class who constitute the I. W. W. very largely?

A. The question of danger is that their passivity may merge to popular passion. That is the underlying danger in the fact that you can't achieve results by passivity alone. You have two alternatives; that is to attempt to do it by force and the other is to go through a long course of patient education of the community.

Q. Were not many strikes won by the use of sabotage in the United States?

A. That depends upon what you mean by the term. They are not included in the term as Syndicalists use it, to mean not collective action but rather individual action for collective needs.

Q. How far would the advocates of present sabotage under the present system be justified by the action of those who for principle threw the tea in Boston Harbor?

A. If they follow the same principles they would lead to the same results. Whether they would be justified is an open question.

IV. THE DEMAND FOR LEISURE

One of the first demands of labour is the demand for release from excessive toil. This becomes also the demand for leisure, and upon the satisfaction of that demand depends the possibility of labour being able to attain its own ideals. The programme of the Socialist or of the Syndicalist, in fact any programme for the development of the welfare of the group of toil, depends upon a certain amount of training, and preparation which can only be secured upon the basis of leisure.

Now labour has made some gains in the direction of securing its primary demand: "a fair day's work for a fair day's pay." In the early part of the last century, the average working day in English-speaking countries was fourteen hours. In the middle of the last century the average working day in this country was twelve hours. As late as 1860 people were working in the cotton mills of Massachusetts for a 13 hour day and a 78 hour week. To-day the average working day in English-speaking countries is about ten hours, and the greatest part of that

gain has come in the last twenty-five years. In Boston the first eight-hour league in this country was organised. In Massachusetts was established the first Bureau of Labor Statistics to give the public the facts, without which this fight for relief from excessive toil could not be successfully waged. The United States Government began to reduce its working day before the middle of the last century, cutting down first to ten hours in its industrial establishments, and then to eight, and that which is good for the Government ought to be good for private industry. But I suppose it is one of the vices of democracy, that we will achieve certain social gains in government employment in order to get the support of labour and will refrain from enforcing those gains in private industry in order not to alienate the employing interests.

We have in the matter of women's labour made still further gains. In the case of both women and minors we have reduced the working day from fourteen and sixteen hours (which it was in the beginning of the last century), to ten and eight. Most child labour laws now in the progressive States refuse to permit the employment of children between fourteen and eighteen years for more than eight hours, and two or three States have eight-hour laws regarding the labour of women. The United States Supreme Court

has upheld the ten-hour law for women and is now considering the eight-hour law.

We have also made some progress in eliminating the seven-day week. There has been a united demand on the part of labour, on the part of intelligent politicians, and on the part of the united churches of this country to secure the relief of labour from the seven-day week. The demand is made on the simple basis of the necessity of the rest day, on the principle that the man is more sacred even than any day, and that to the man must be secured the right of rest. When labour becomes fully aware of the necessity for the weekly rest day and will join with its full force with the allied groups in making that demand, we shall secure it, in every State in this Union. It is an indication again of the backwardness of our social organisation that only at this late day we should be enforcing a demand for a weekly rest day.

There are probably almost 20 per cent. of the workers of this country who are working where the twelve-hour day still obtains. That percentage covers of course a great many skilled trades where the eight-hour day has been secured by organisation and it therefore leaves a great many trades and industries where the twelve-hour day is still running. The steel trade is the greatest offender in this respect. United States Steel

insists that less than 30 per cent. of its men are working a twelve-hour day, but that is not a fair computation for the reason that it covers all the men in the employ of the steel trust. When you limit the inquiry, as it should be limited, to the men working in those branches of the trade in which the twelve-hour shift is practiced, for example the blast-furnaces, you have between fifty and sixty per cent. that are working the twelve-hour day. In spite of the fact that the steel manufacturers of Great Britain and Germany have gone over to the eight-hour day and have been more proficient in production as a result, the Iron and Steel Institute of this country refuses to abolish the twelve-hour shift.

In this country the gains in reducing the hours of labour have been secured in the face of the opposition of the employers who have steadfastly, for the most part, opposed both organised labour in its attempt for shorter hours and have fought short hour legislation through their lobbies. And it is the power of organised labour that has called attention to the necessity for short hour legislation. It was the bookbinders of England who first proposed the ten-hour law; it was the ship caulkers of the United States, back in 1806, who produced the first ten-hour law here; it was organised labour in Australia

that formed the first Eight Hour League; and it was only when the Women's Trade Union League became an active force in making legislation that we were able to procure legislation for women and children. The great initiating force in shortening the working day has been the organised labour of this country.

THE RESULTS OF FATIGUE

The essence of the first demand in this field of the shorter work-day is that labour should be protected from the results of fatigue. When you are trying to set the length of the working day by law, for the defence not simply of the working group industrially but for the defence of society, the principle that enters in is the principle that labour must not be worked beyond the point of fatigue. That is the position on which the United States Supreme Court upholds short day legislation for women. On the basis of evidence showing the physical effects of fatigue, the court held that the public good demands that women should not be worked beyond the point of fatigue, that being presumably the limit of the defensive power of the State.

When you take the human animal out of his natural outdoor environment and put him to work within four walls, you are creating a serious disturbance in his constitution. You are

not simply taking him out of his fresh air environment; you are putting him into a factory and exposing him to a strain of noise and speed. You are requiring the human body, both its muscular and nervous system, to speed up beyond its natural rhythm, beyond the natural *tempo* of its movements, to keep up with the rhythm of the machine, and the result of that is a serious derangement, both physical and nervous.

The first results are seen in the records of accidents, for from 70 to 90 per cent. of our industrial accidents occur after the hour of three o'clock in the afternoon, and the larger proportion of these occur in the last hour of the working day. It is the tenth hour of the working day that is the deadly hour in the factory, because then nature's safety defences have been broken through, because the worker has passed the point of fatigue.

Perhaps the most conclusive report on health ever shown to the world is the report of our Committee of One Hundred on National Vitality, now a United States document, and it makes this statement: "The present working day, from a physical standpoint, is altogether too long, and keeps the majority of women or men in a continual state of over-fatigue." Now the pathologists tell us to-day that there is a definite poison

set up in the human system by over-work. They name it "the toxin of fatigue." When the muscular or nervous energy has been worked to the point of fatigue the body no longer carries off the poisonous secretions; they remain in the system, and besides having their own toxic effect they render the body more liable to the attacks of disease, they weaken its resistance power to the germs that lie in wait for all of us. And that is the great reason for the high mortality rate of the wage earning group, from contagious disease, and from that group of diseases known as "misery" diseases. It is because their resistance power has been lowered.

One of the most striking studies to show the injustice of our industrial systems is to take the mortality maps of our various cities and then to find out the district in which that mortality is massed. When you know the cities you will find in every case that those mortality maps show the death rate to be the most in the districts where the lowest paid groups of industrial workers live. That is, the death rate is highest in groups that are paid the least and worked the hardest, where life is lived at the lowest level and where it has the smallest chance of resisting the attacks upon it. And the effects are shown not only in the mortality rate but also in the effect upon birth, not simply upon the birth rate, al-

though that is lowered in the outstanding industrial centres, but it is shown in the lowering of vitality at birth. When you bring into the world children whose parents have been weakened to the point of exhaustion, physically and nervously, through years of fatigue accompanied by the lack of adequate nourishment or proper housing and fresh air, those children come into the world without an adequate physical fighting chance. We talk sometimes, in our careless, flippant way, about folks who are "born tired." There is a scientific truth in that very phrase. There are children born of exhausted, undernourished parents, who are literally at birth too tired ever to have a fair fighting chance. They can't be efficient either industrially, intellectually, or morally. They have not the energy; they have not the vitality; and, furthermore, we take no pains to see that they get a chance to make up that defect. Those children are placed in the worst kind of environment, in the lowest sections of our cities. And then we talk about the wastrels and derelicts in the gutters of our cities and wonder at the cause! From the standpoint even merely of profitable business on the present basis, what greater stupidity could there be than to weaken people to the point of exhaustion and then produce a still weaker generation the next time? What agriculturist would pur-

sue such a stupid policy in trying to procure his draft animals? He knows better. We know better, too, only we have not yet got the conscience to apply our knowledge in the way we ought.

It was because of this fact of the lessening of vitality, by fatigue that the United States Supreme Court made its decision concerning the ten-hour law for women. You will remember what part Boston had in that by presenting the brains and the heart which made that thing possible, as a gift, to the working classes of this country; and it was because the brains of Mr. Brandeis and that woman who worked with him in putting before the Supreme Court such a mass of medical evidence gathered from the whole world to show conclusively the effects of fatigue in weakening the next generation, that the Supreme Court wrote a new principle into the law: that the health of the nation is more important than the goods that can be produced by overworked labour. In the near future, when we can get the same mass of facts presented to the same courts concerning the labour of men, the nation will, by that time, have made up its mind that it can no more afford to have weak, unhealthy fathers than it can have weak unhealthy mothers.

The results of fatigue appear not merely in the

physical world; they appear also in the economic realm. Labour carried to the point of fatigue means economic loss. That Report on National Vitality astonished the nation by showing that we were wasting an enormous amount of money, computed simply from the potential earnings of those dying from preventable diseases in this country. Then it showed that the economic waste from undue fatigue was much greater than that from the great preventable diseases; that the number of people who suffer from partial disability due to fatigue constitutes the great majority of the population. So we have here a great social evil from which the whole population is suffering but from which the industrial section is suffering more than any other group in the population.

Now besides the directly traceable economic loss which comes from the inefficiency in production of those who are worked to the point of fatigue, there is also the indirect economic loss that the long working day brings. It involves a low wage, and that means a low standard of living, and that means a small measure of consumption and that means that the economic capacity of the country is constantly reduced. The old saw is perfectly correct that said:

> "Whether you work by the piece or the day,
> Decreasing the hour increases the pay."

Indirectly, of course, this is true, not only for the wage-earning population affected but for the whole of society. Because when you decrease the working day, you raise the standard of living and increase the demands of the wage earning group,—you therefore make the demand for more production, more men are employed, and again you raise the standard of living. It is economically profitable to employers to reduce the working day and increase the standard of living for the working group. The short hour day has proved this even under the present system; it has been demonstrated again and again.

In 1881 a report of the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics declared that in the Atlantic States the reduction of the working day from eleven to ten hours had produced an increase and not a decrease, economically. In many places the eight-hour day has also proved economically more profitable. One of the best outstanding cases is that of the United States Government, based upon two battleships built in 1894 from the same plans. One was built in the Government shipyards at eight hours a day; one was built by private contract at ten hours a day; and when they got through the Government-built ship, on the eight hour day proposition, showed conclusively that the average work per man per

hour was over 25 per cent. more than on the ten hour day privately built ship.

Over in England in the iron and steel trade is another remarkable illustration. There organised labour and capital worked together to demonstrate the increased efficiency due to shorter hours. Organised labour agreed that it would have to reduce gradually by small groups of men, so as to make the change without undue derangement of the industry and that those who were getting the higher wage would have to pay a bonus to those who would have to get a lower wage until it could be demonstrated that the experiment was profitable. The result was that in a very short time the whole change was effected and that bonus didn't have to be paid because it was proved that the change resulted in increase of production.

Now of course there is a limit to the increase of production because by shortening the workday, although you can speed up the men in many industries, in some machine industries you can't speed up the machines. In some industries it is economically profitable to run on the eight hour rather than on the nine or the ten or the twelve hour basis. Where it is not, where the effect of reducing hours is to reduce the profits, it raises the fundamental question of the reward of the

capitalists and its relations to the community good. When that question is raised the only answer of the community must be that the reduction of the working day cannot be determined by the question of profits, but simply and solely by the question of social welfare. The question is to whom does this matter of profits fundamentally refer? Are we to consider here the economic values simply in terms of the good of one group that happens in the course of social development now to have possession of industry, or are we to consider economic values in terms of the good of the whole community? If we decide the latter, the next question is, if we are to consider simply whether the short day is profitable to the whole community economically speaking, or whether its profit is to be considered in terms of the net results to human life. And the new economy, corresponding to the quickened sense of human justice — the new economy that is just getting itself written in the text-books — insists that the only final economic standard is that of human values and not the production of goods.

I picked up my morning paper this morning and I found an editorial on the question of industrial conservation — the results of a study of a professor in a great university concerning the effects of scientific management — and I find it

classified under three heads: complete success, partial success and failure. The standard of success is whether there has been an increased profit and an increased wage — "business three times what it was before" — "$18,000 saved in six years," with no attempt to determine the offset in the way of deteriorated health. The modern political economy is not satisfied with such a test as that. We want to know not simply whether there is more profits and more wages, but what are the long-time results to human life, what are the results in the end to the worker and to society; and not merely whether or not he has shown any sickness in the first year of this efficiency scheme but what is the result over a period of years to his nervous system and his moral and mental nature. That is what we want to know before we are going to pass judgment on the value of this thing. The question is not answered by showing increased efficiency in production, or no immediate depreciation in health; it is only answered when you trace the results of the fatigue engendered by this efficiency process, back over a period of years, in its individual and moral results. And so, finally, we are going to settle this question of fatigue and speeding up, and efficiency, by its moral and social results. What are they?

Go through the twelve hour communities and

find out! Let the scientists tell you from their Report on Vitality. They declare that fatigue starts a vicious circle, involving drunkenness and other excesses. Let another scientist speak: "The first school of man's family life is a closed book against the man who only comes home dead tired at night." Go through the twelve hour communities in this country and you will find confirmation of this statement. You will find there increased consumption of alcohol, with a lower degradation of human life; you will find there also the most brutal forms of vice existing as a natural result of reducing human nature to the brute state. The mental and moral and social results, in the broadest sense, of fatigue, are simply disastrous to society. This is increasingly clear in the case of the labour of girls and women; there it is particularly clear. When you face the great fact that the armies of vice are recruited preponderantly (almost universally) from the wage earning group, you are facing one of the moral effects of fatigue. The relation of improper conditions of labour for girls and women to vice is not simply a relation between low wages with monotonous life and easy money with excitement — no such bald choice is thrown up as that (except in a very few cases) to the working women of this country. What happens is this; the slow breaking down of nature's moral

safety devices by the long process of fatigue. Then, as the great majority of testimony from the places of vice proves, then life itself becomes the betrayer because nature has been reduced to the point of exhaustion almost, through a period of over-work and monotonous occupation.

When moral disaster does not occur whether in manhood or womanhood, as the effect of fatigue, you still have other serious moral results. You have life reduced almost to the brute level, you have life that is simply one round of toil, with then perhaps some corresponding excitement to atone for the monotony of its dead level, but with no response to the stimulus for the development of the higher nature. In the twelve hour communities the low level of life is the worst fact that the social observer has to face — the fact that life has no power of reaching up because its energies are so exhausted, that it has no capacity to climb because it has been kept down by the dead pressure of fatigue.

THE RESULTS OF LEISURE

If the first duty is to rescue the group at the bottom from the pressure of fatigue, the next duty is to secure for the industrial group the results of leisure. If the industrial group must be protected from the results of fatigue it must have access to the results of leisure; and the

results of leisure are culture. All your superstructure of civilisation depends upon a certain degree of leisure and if men are to be educated they must be released from exhausting toil, they must be released from continued application to the work of producing the necessities of life if they are to have any chance to climb up to the heights of culture. You may define culture in any sense you please. You may have the Greek ideal of culture of the body. What chance has a man worked to the point of fatigue to follow that ideal whether he sits over a desk or works with a pick in the street; in either occupation what chance has he? You may tell him that his body needs a bath every morning to allow it to breathe; you may tell him that his muscles need exercise; is he going to get it? Has he the time and the strength? And you may build your gymnasiums and your swimming pools, and they are of no benefit, as long as he is worked to the point of exhaustion. You have physical maladjustment instead of physical development.

You tell men that there are opportunities for mental culture. No man who is speeded up for ten hours a day has got time or energy enough left over from the bread and butter business of life to make that struggle, to go through that process of discipline. Here stands a Hebrew beside a machine in the sweat of New York, and

he says: "If I am hungry in New York someone will give me a crust, and if I am thirsty someone will give me a drink, but now my soul is thirsty for knowledge and my mind is starving for learning, and who will give it to me?" He says: "Men tell me to go to night school. Have they ever tried it after working ten hours a day at a machine?" You can extend your night school system as much as you please, boast as you may about our free educational system, if people have not time to take advantage of it, it is all a bitter mockery to them. As the Colorado steel worker said: "Andy can build a library but it's no good to build it here. We twelve hour men have no time or strength to read his books."

Here comes Professor Steiner, who has come up from it all and he says: "The end of the day, when the work was over, proved to be the hardest period of my experience. I went to sleep at once when the strain was over. I was just like the cattle." We treat them like cattle and then call them cattle. He was then working in the steel mill in Pittsburgh ten hours a day. He says: "The worst feature is the day's complete exhaustion which follows long hours with its numbness and the dullness that grips into a man's soul. At the end of a ten hour day in the steel mill, if I had been offered anything except a good

supper and bed, I would not have accepted it, although I was hungry for the other things."

Now it is harder to climb out than it was twenty years ago when Professor Steiner climbed.

This same thing is true about the development of the spiritual life. If a man is going to have a chance to develop his spirit, if he is to hold high converse with the great and lofty ones of the past, to invite his soul into fellowship with the Eternal, to throw his passionate spirit into the great struggle for brotherhood and justice, he must have time and strength to do these things.

The cultured class is the leisure class; and if we are going to have culture throughout the whole of our society, we must have leisure throughout the whole of society. And remember this also: a leisure class is never a truly cultured class, for the cultured class is a working class too. God didn't make some folks all muscle and others all brain. He didn't make some all hands and others all mind. He put them together, and the divorce of so-called culture and productive work has been one of the fatal fallacies of civilisation. We have to put culture into the very heart of the industrial process and let a man in the making of things find the development of his mind; let him there, as he does the work of the world, find all the beauty and all the art,

and all the music and all the joy; let him there put his soul into fellowship with the eternal, give his spirit into bonds of brotherhood with his fellowmen. That will be true culture — that the human race may develop its soul while working out things.

THE RIGHT TO LIVE

Thus we see that the demand for leisure is the demand for life itself. It is the demand for the results of leisure, the attainment of all true culture. Somebody stops to ask: "How will he use it?" That question is not before the house. There is a previous question there that must be answered first. When you have given men their rights you can begin to talk about how they should use them and not before. And I would like to ask what class has the right to raise that question to the labour group? Is it the idle rich? Watch their clubs and their drawing rooms and their New Year's feasts in the restaurants. Is it the business men? I read the other day in a local paper that an official of this State had to send an officer of the law to follow him to a banquet of the business men to which he had been invited, because it was so indecent. Is it the intellectual group? I go to the high-brow club only to get poisoned with the same foul air that I find in the labour hall. Is it the college

group? Watch their athletics conducted on the same commercialised, gladiatoral plan that made a Roman holiday. It does not lie in the mouth of any group in this country to raise that question about the labour group. As a matter of fact, every time the labour group has secured leisure it has used it for its social development. Of course there will be individuals who will abuse liberty, but the net result of liberty has been this: wherever the eight hour day exists it has been used for the intellectual and moral development of the worker. There is no justification for the charge that indirectly the reduction of hours and the raising of the living standard is strengthening the organised forces of iniquity. To-day when you want support for a moral proposition, when the churches want support in a temperance fight, the labour leaders supply it. I have just learned to-day that the strongest support for a certain proposition in the fight against alcohol is from the leaders of the labour group. They are coming to understand how to use their time, how to use it for the development of their own capacities in order that they may climb to their proper place.

The demand for leisure is the demand for life itself. We have been expanding life. It is a bigger world we live in — new horizons in government, in industry, new horizons in thought,

everywhere. And in that expanding world you have put the industrial worker into a smaller world and a smaller environment. For your automatic machine worker is not as big a man as the old craftsman that preceded him. And when that automatic man is worked to the point of exhaustion he is still smaller; yet in this bigger world you need larger men. So it is not his loss alone; it is a menace to society to suffer that man to become smaller. He becomes a prey to the pressure of special interests on both sides of this social question; he becomes the easy tool of political demagogues; he becomes the dupe of priestcraft, of quackery in religion. And the world needs that man because he is the man who makes the group that is going to control the world to-morrow. The world needs that man to have the biggest development and environment that can be accorded to him. The democracy of the Carpenter of Nazareth demands that. You read the Scripture and you can't see why the banker should go home at three or four o'clock and the labourer should stay in the mills until six o'clock. There is no justice to it. The men who do the harder, longer, and more dangerous work are the ones who need more recreation and more chance for the release from the effects of that toil. The teachings of the Carpenter demand that we drive out of the world

forever and ever the idea that one class of people are to do all the difficult, dangerous and monotonous work.

We cannot have a Brahmin class of culture in our land with special privilege in leisure and a monopoly of intellectual service.

The rule of the world to-morrow is to go to brains, and brains must be developed if we are to have a universal and permanent democracy in the world. The teachings of Jesus demand this — that there shall be no group of special privilege in society, that the innermost worth of the downmost man shall be developed to the uttermost point. It demands a brotherhood of labour and toil where all the people share in the dangers and difficulties of the hard work of the world, and a brotherhood of leisure where all the people share equally in all the opportunities of culture and development.

Q. Is not the rate of progress of the present time more important than its direction?

A. I think that the direction is established, and I agree with the question that the main task now is to accelerate the rate of progress in that direction.

Q. Is there any group of disciples who are following the rules laid down by the Carpenter of Nazareth?

A. I know many groups. I meet them in all walks of life; some in the employing group, some in the trade union group, some in the socialist group, some in the syndicalist group, some in the privileged class, who are genuinely trying, as best they can, to follow and carry out that teaching.

Q. Does not the capitalist foresee the ultimate break-down of labour and so refuses to hire men after forty years of age, getting all the labour he can out of men between sixteen and thirty?

A. That is getting to be the general rule in large industry, and scientific management increases the proportion.

Q. Should not the employed class try to work out their own salvation and organize themselves for mutual protection instead of worrying about a job?

A. That would be one of the best things they could do.

Q. Which is preferable, the group of thinkers who strive for more liberty leaving economic questions to take care of themselves, or the group who strive for economic gains leaving leisure to take care of itself?

A. Hitch them up and drive them double.

Q. Does not the cultured class have to work? Do you advise your theological students when they get a parish to get out and work?

A. I think I made it clear that no class can be truly cultured that separates itself from the actual work of the world. We shall never get the higher type of culture until we join mental work with actual production. We are trying to do it with our theological students as nearly as possible.

Q. How about the short time as applied to the farmer? Doesn't it hurt the smaller one unduly?

A. No, if we get rid of the concentrated control of the transportation of farm products the small farmer has a good chance.

Q. What is the title of the report of the Committee of One Hundred?

A. Report on National Vitality.

Q. If the eight hour life is economically proved sound why isn't it adopted by all manufacturers?

A. I heard a man say the other day that you can't legislate for blame fools.

Q. If a man goes to work at four o'clock, works until twelve o'clock, then has half an hour for lunch, goes back to work at twelve-thirty, and works until eight-thirty, is that an eight hour law? And if it occurs on Saturday does that make for leisure? And if the last hour of that period goes over into Sunday does it assist Christianity?

A. That is nothing but pure pagan slavery and if you will tell us where it is carried on in this city we will try to have it stopped.

Q. It is carried on in the United States Government.

A. There has been a demand afoot recently regarding the postal carriers; an attempt to overwork them and evade the law. That attempt has been checked. That is not the kind of eight hour law I would stand for.

Q. Is not the farmer that works from ten to twelve hours a day out in the open air abundantly able to perform that work, because he is doing it for himself?

A. That depends upon the kind of man he is. If he wants to live in the largest sense of the word he had better get through his day's work in less time than that.

Q. I would like to have the speaker's definition of leisure.

A. I was using the term to-day of course in the sense of sufficient release from the necessary economic work of life in order to develop the higher side of human nature.

Q. I meant "culture."

A. I will leave that to the newspapers.

Q. Doesn't the speeding up process of machinery bring about a condition where the eight hours under such circumstances is worse than the ten hours under ordinary circumstances?

A. The eight hour law is no good until you put into the legislation something about speed as well as time.

V. THE DEMAND FOR INCOME

THE SOCIAL SURPLUS, ITS DISTRIBUTION

THE first demand of labour is for a fair day's work and for a fair day's pay. That demand enlarges, as the labour movement expands, into a demand for leisure following the demand for a release from the long day, and also into a demand for income following the demand for release from starvation wages. These two demands belong together and, of course, the demand of labour for income is only one expression of the universal demand. We sometimes forget that; because labor's demand for income comes to us a little more directly and sometimes a little more harshly than the demand of other groups. We all must remember that the demand of the agricultural group, of the capitalist group and of the professional group is not different from the demand of the industrial, wage earning group. The wizard of finance, he milks us tenderly. But labour's voice is harsh and his hand is rough. Your great capitalist puts his finger skilfully into your pocket and takes out what he wants by fractions, in the cost of food or the price of transportation, and if you don't exactly bless him for

it, at least you rather admire him for it. But when the mechanical wage earner comes along, it seems as though he were saying, "Hands-up," because what he wants has come out in a bigger sum, and directly. We shall not approach this question fairly until we realise, as Kennedy tried to teach the folks of England in "The Servant in the House," that the man who cleans the drains has just as much right to the best of life as the man who makes sermons or poems. I suppose, in this land of democracy, we should now all concede that the plumber has a right to live like a gentleman — only, of course, we don't want him to act like a pirate, when he can use his power.

This demand for income is like the demand for leisure. It is an expression of the fundamental right to live and not merely to exist. For life in its highest form, the life of culture and development, rests equally upon the possession of sufficient leisure to develop it and sufficient income to maintain it.

RELATION OF INCOME TO LIFE

Income bears this direct relation to life — the lack of it means that life is weakened, diminished and distorted and finally becomes degenerate. The difference between a low and high order of civilisation may not be, as some witty cynic has

said, " the difference between a piece of bread and a piece of beefsteak," but there is a fundamental difference, nevertheless, between the results of adequate nourishment and the results of under-nourishment. As the world is learning to-day, that if you want armies to fight it is as important to feed them properly as to give them ammunition, so we must learn that if we want the wage earners to fight for us, to do the work of the world properly, they will have to be fed poperly.

Under-nourishment or lack of proper nourishment and of physical fitness leads you in a vicious circle. It makes for inefficiency, which leads to disease. That results in a still lower income, and so around and around you go in that vicious circle until finally you have a group that is so far below the normal standard both physically, mentally and morally, that it is, in fact, a degenerate group. You can find that group in a greater or less degree in every one of your industrial cities as the result of the continuance of that vicious circle of under-nourishment, disease and inefficiency.

On the other hand, the presence of sufficient income and nourishment is absolutely necessary, of course, to the higher life. Would folks get educated? Books cost money. Would folks develop the spiritual side of life, the things upon which man's spiritual nature feeds? It requires

income to provide them. The folks who haven't got the income have to face a more serious hunger than the hunger for bread; it is the hunger for beauty, it is the hunger for knowledge, it is the hunger for spiritual satisfaction and growth. And that is the real force that is to-day driving the industrial wage-earning group to demand more income.

They see the higher life and want to have an American standard of living really brought to them. We think with some justice that we have a somewhat higher average of efficiency here than elsewhere, but that efficiency depends upon that standard of living and that standard of living depends upon a certain expenditure. It means higher tastes, it means an increased demand for the wherewithal to satisfy those tastes and that standard. And folks ask: "Where is this thing going to stop?" as if they conceive of the wage earner standing continually, like Oliver Twist, holding his bowl out and always asking for more. Now in the name of all that is just where should it stop short of the satisfaction of this demand?

I remember a conference that we had in Chicago regarding welfare work in factories and I remember one labourer getting up and saying: "Now, we are very glad to know that some of you people have proposed to put bathing privileges in the factories and give us a chance to clean

up before we go home; we all want to look decent, but there is something else we want. We want bathtubs in our homes and we are going to have them, too." I remember another man saying: "Where is this thing going to stop? Why, the next thing they will want is pianos in their homes." And he called himself an American and a Christian! Now to him, whose chief goal in life had been the making of money, not the serving of his fellowmen — they go together sometimes, but not often or always — to him, the bathtub and the piano might be luxuries, but to the modern American Christian this and a great many other things are simply necessities, necessities of the higher life. And as long as you are teaching higher standards of living in the public schools and as long as you are showing the results of this higher standard of living, you may depend upon it that just so long the demand of the industrial wage-earning class is being increased by all of the natural, normal processes of our American civilisation. And that demand will not stop. You can't compare the condition of folks here to what they had in the old country. You can't compare the condition of folks here with what men had in similar places forty and fifty years ago. The only sound basis of comparison is with the average living standard which they see around them on the one hand, and on the

other hand with the actual amount of their production, as they are coming increasingly to see it to-day. These are the comparisons that have to be made, and in so far as Christian ethics is concerned, the whole impact of Christianity is to increase that demand and not to lessen it.

A man stood up in a meeting that I attended in another city concerning welfare work and he said — he was a machinist in a factory: "I want something more than welfare work in the factory." He said: "I have got two boys in my home and I don't want them to go through the mill." His voice broke. "I want to put them through the college up here on the hill. I want a chance to do my welfare work in my own family in my own way."

I got a letter last week from a man in a town where I had been speaking. He was a foreman. He said that he had never lost his sympathy with the folks who were not earning as much wages as he was. And, said he: "I have never been able to realise my ideal, which I believe is the right of every wage earner, and that is to put my children through college." Now, you say: "If that ideal is to be satisfied, who is going to do the rough and hard work of the world?" If you are attempting to satisfy the righteous ideals of mankind, you will find a way to settle that — and some more practical questions also.

There is no group in a community that is built around the democratic principle that can assume the right to higher education for its children and deny that right to any other group in the community. In so far as Christian ethics are concerned, we stand for the expanded life for all, not for the limited, constricted, ascetic life. It is the life more abundant that the Carpenter talks about; not simply life everlasting in the world to come, but the hundred-fold more abundant life in this present world. Just as we have proclaimed the right of every human soul to that eternal life, so must we proclaim the right of every human soul to the more abundant life in this present world and so must we support all of the forces which will help to realise that great ideal.

But some practical man says: "How can it be done? There seem to be such limits to human life and economic results that the Almighty Himself has put an eternal sanction on the division of folks into classes with their limitations." Modern economic science is offering cold comfort to folks who take refuge in that kind of a theory, because it is but a theory. We have to-day a great social surplus that has been built up by the improvement of scientific knowledge, methods of industrial organisation and agricultural production. For the first time in

human history, the human race is now living on a surplus instead of on a deficit basis. In the long generations of the past, races were struggling to get food sufficient to afford a proper basis for the existence of human life, but that condition no longer exists. Here is a great social surplus built up, being produced in a greater amount than will satisfy the hunger of the whole human race. Here are being piled up not only the necessities but also the luxuries of life. We see the evidence of that social surplus all around us. Here in the past few weeks man after man has gone on the stand before the Commission on Industrial Relations and told how they have been giving their scores and their hundreds of millions away. They have been distributing this social surplus which has been built up by the combined efforts and favours of many people together, and by a combination of circumstances and the pressure of the social environment. Now labour stands looking at that immense social surplus. And labour stands also looking at the place where it is going; sees it going for health in China (as labour's voice has recently said), for pensions to university professors, and for the feeding of birds; while at the same time the labour that has helped to make that surplus in these very industries is not

able to properly nourish and adequately educate its own children.

Therefore we face a question that is absolutely different from the question of the reward of the individual worker. We face the question of the distribution by groups of this great social surplus; we face the fact that at present it is being distributed on no basis of justice whatever and that the results of this unjust distribution are socially detrimental both at the top and at the bottom of society. The figures have been so often repeated that they have become trite: the fact that 10 per cent. of our people in this country own 90 per cent. of the wealth and that the other 90 per cent. have incomes which would scarcely make spending money for the 10 per cent.; the fact that the amount produced — the market value of the amount produced by the average industrial wage earner, according to the United States Census figures, is just about three times the amount of the average industrial wage earner's income in this country. When the wage-earning group gets educated to that fact, they are going to ask how this thing has been juggled and even under the present system, with capital requiring its rights and management requiring its rights, labour is going to stop the magicians who have been shifting this three-fold shell and

is going to find out under which shell its particular pea has been concealed.

You have another fundamental fact concerning the distribution of the fruits of industry and that is the relation of the wages of the industrial group to the cost of living. The fact is, that the cost of high living, or the high cost of living, whichever way you wish to put it, is pressing harder upon the industrial wage-earning group, perhaps, than upon the professional group and the lower section of the middle class group. We have no adequate figures in this country to make a perfectly exact statement, but such figures as we have tend to indicate that at least 75 per cent. of the male workers north of the Mason and Dixon line are to-day getting less than a living wage, when you compute the living wage for the average family of five (that is, a man and wife and three children), on the basis of mere necessities. For example, 75 per cent. of the workers north of the Mason and Dixon line are getting less than $600 a year. All our standard of living figures indicate that the actual cost of subsistence — mere physical necessities — for the average family is from $400 to $600 a year according to the section of the country, and that the cost of an adequate living, that is, providing something for recreation, something for sickness,

something for old age, is somewhere between $750 and $1,000 according to the section of the country and the city concerned. Now just broad facts like that indicate the fundamental inequity of our present distribution of the joint product of our common work process, and indicate something more,— that we have not yet attempted to divide that product, generally speaking, on a basis of justice.

The facts are undeniable: that prices rise before wages and always fall after wages have fallen, and ever the income of the wage-earning group is pressed down toward the line of subsistence. If it is pressed up at all, it is pressed up usually only by the efforts of the workers themselves through their own organisations. And the question that is raised here concerning the right of the wage earners to share in the fruits of our civilisation, to share more largely in the material basis for the higher life, is a question that must be answered simply and solely by the standard of justice. No amount of philanthropy, no amount of benevolent paternalism, no amount of welfare work, will either satisfy or evade that question. It is a question that cannot be downed in the world as long as we have a conscience created by the ethics taught by Jesus.

When we come to answer that question, there

are one or two methods that are being tried to remove or lessen the inequity. Organisation has pushed wages up through collective bargaining and has secured a higher standard of living for certain of its own members. In addition to that a defence has been put up for some of the helpless creatures at the bottom of the labour group by the legislative provision of a minimum wage. That has not been extended very far in this country yet. I think only seven States have it and in two of those the attempt is only to make public the effect of the inadequacy of the wage and to depend upon the pressure of public opinion to bring about a beneficial result. The principle enacted by law,— the method may be worked out in different ways,— has resulted in some marked gains for the group at the bottom of industry. In this country we are attempting to apply it simply to the working girls and helpless working women, the working girls and women who have to live on an income of five, and six, and eight dollars per week. One of these working girls said: "If I spend more than seven cents for a lunch I think I am extravagant." Another said: "If I should spend thirty cents for a dinner, I don't know what would happen, and," said she, "I am tired to death of living on these twenty cent dinners." When I see men at the other end of society spending their two, three, four and

five dollars for a dinner, I realise that we have a fundamental task here, imperative to the Christian conscience, to adjust these differences.

That will be conceded pretty generally now by the intelligent and humane management of industry. I remember a man at the head of one of the great steel corporations of this country who was objecting very seriously to some of the proposals made for the betterment of the condition of the workingman. He said: "You are going to utterly disorganise the present conditions in the industrial world." But after a while he made this significant admission: "I am willing to admit, however, that there is altogether too much difference between the life of the president of our corporation and the man who works in the mill and mine for us." If that admission be made, it shows an imperative necessity for some sort of a change, and demands that we procure measures which will lessen that difference. While some employers of labour were at a meeting of an investigating commission stating that the working girl could live perfectly adequately on eight dollars per week, the executor of an estate was at the same time making application to a court for an increase in the income of the girl for whom it was held. He said that $12,000 was not an adequate income for her and he requested that it be raised by $8,000. The kind

court raised the income from $12,000 to $20,000 a year. As long as you have some girls of sixteen years who must have $20,000 a year to live on, you must have thousands of others who have got to get along on eight dollars a week. Something must be done to bring relief from this obvious injustice.

A defensive minimum wage measure has been put around the group down at the bottom. The principle is the thing which must be considered. The principle, as given in the words of the ancient Book, is that the husbandman must be the first partaker of the fruits. Other rights that come in there must come in after that principle has been recognised and worked out. The first charge upon industry, from the standpoint of Christian ethics, is the adequate support of all those who are engaged in that industry. All other charges whatsoever come secondary to that. Now instead of conceding that principle, we are engaged in this country in disputing about the methods of applying it without regard to the cold facts. The facts are clear here and in England. They show that so far a defensive minimum wage law has raised the income of the lowest group in each industry, where it has been applied. In Australia and New Zealand the facts are still clearer, with a minimum wage established not by legislation but in each partic-

ular industry by a wage board composed of workers and employers. That minimum wage so established has not only proved an adequate defence for the underfed, overworked group at the bottom but has resulted in a great uniform improvement for the wage-earning class and has also resulted profitably to the employer.

These facts cannot be gainsaid, and therefore in this country we must come to realise immediately that the industry which pays less than a living wage is a parasitic industry, socially undesirable, which the community cannot afford to maintain. It matters not whether the cause of that industry's paying less than a living wage is the greed of the management or the inefficiency of the management, and it is one or the other, as your investigation in Massachusetts, by your Minimum Wage Commission shows. Whatever the cause, the community cannot afford to maintain a greedy management or an absolutely inefficient management. The social results of the lack of a living wage, the results in disease, the results in inefficiency, the results in delinquency — all burdens which the community has to carry — these social results are so great that the community is justified in saying to individuals: "We cannot permit you to manufacture such results as this along with your profits."

PROFIT SHARING

The next step is the step of profit sharing. That is being increasingly tried in this country. It was remarkable to notice the unanimity with which the great industrial managers and the financial magnates testified to the Industrial Commission that profit-sharing was desirable and workable and the next step. The value of profit-sharing depends upon the kind of profit-sharing. There is one kind that has proved absolutely unsuccessful, and it deserved to fail. It is not profit-sharing. It is one of the smoothest confidence games ever put over on an unsuspicious public, and that is the profit-sharing which is nothing more or less than a bonus for increased production. If more capital is put into an industry, the charge on that capital is taken out before the profits are determined; if more management is put into it, the charge for that increased management is also taken out before profits are distributed. But not so with labour. The result is that without any increased charge for capital and with no increased charge for management, the management says: "If you will be kind enough to produce a certain amount more than you have been producing, we will be good enough to give you a certain part of it." All that is made is made

absolutely by the workers and capital simply appropriates what it can of that and gives the rest of it as a bonus to the workers. Of course, that type of profit-sharing does not work out. It does not relieve the friction of the industrial procedure. It is often a deliberate attempt to take the workers away from the beneficial results of organisation and self-expression and to set up a substitute for organisation on the part of the workers. Concerning that attempt something severer needs to be said, for it is socially harmful. It involves certain results to society in friction, in the denial of the natural self-development of the industrial group which are dangerous to our social progress.

But there is a type of profit-sharing which is eminently just and which has the proper spirit and method. That is the type of profit-sharing which approaches the whole situation not to get further profits by giving bonuses, but with a desire really to do justice, with a desire really to find out what labour has been contributing to the product which it has not been getting. And whenever any management in this country has put up a plan of profit-sharing with an attempt to do justice to co-workers, the results have been highly desirable, both for the individual industry and for society as a whole. It must involve not only an attempt to do justice and an attempt to

discover what labour really produces; it must involve also the democratic spirit — the willingness to consult and co-operate with the wage earning group and give it a voice in the control of terms of labour. In your own city in one of your great stores, we have a genuine attempt toward a just and democratic profit-sharing plan. All such attempts as that are steps toward the ultimate goal. They are steps in a sound and healthful social progress and all who contribute to them deserve the thanks of society.

IS THE WAGE SYSTEM FINAL?

But is that final? Are we able to ameliorate the injustices of the present system by profit-sharing, by minimum wage laws for the group at the bottom, and collective bargaining on the part of organised labour? Is the wage system final? Is it the last thing in the division of the product of industry? Well, we might remember in passing that there are few things that are final. The trouble with most folks is that they seem to think that the condition of life in which they happen to have been born and have grown up is eternal. The wage system is the essential feature in the capitalistic method of production and distribution. But the capitalistic method is only a temporary phase of the world's industrial progress. And the wage system has this about it,— that it

does not harmonise with our present democratic development. By it, the members of the employing group determine arbitrarily their share of the joint product. This power is limited, of course, as labour gets the power to express itself. It is limited also by legislation. But in the main the central feature of the present wage system is that the employer can say how much his reward shall be within certain economic and industrial limits. It leaves that power there, and on the other hand he can also say very largely what the reward of those who work with him shall be. This is one reason why the wage system is standing out to-day as inefficient and is admitted to be so by some of the large industrial managements in this country, and that is the reason for profit-sharing. The inefficiency lies essentially here, that the wage earner is not working for himself primarily but for somebody else. He does not know how much he is working for somebody else. The fact that he is working for somebody else is resulting in profit and gain, and he does not know to what extent, and that stings his sense of injustice. A man will work for others with more zeal than he will work for himself if he is working freely and voluntarily in the service of common good, but when he is working for some very limited group, for some few individuals all the time, that very fact is working in

a manner more or less effectively to make him an inefficient worker.

Then the wage system is being challenged also because it is unscientific. Our economists are telling us that it is not a scientific method of determining the product of labour. There are more than fourteen different wage theories travelling around. Did you ever try to determine what made wages? Did you ever go into a community to determine why unskilled labour was getting $1.50 a day? The only answer I have ever gotten in my attempts to discover this was that somebody, years ago, hired some unskilled labour and on a rough estimate he started to pay $1.50 a day for that unskilled labour. That wage was adjusted to the necessities of that time. But because the labourer got $1.50 a day then, he is still getting it and he tries to live on it. Cases like that show why our present wage system is absolutely unscientific. This one case is an example of the fact that the wage system is very largely a gamble. It is a gamble both on the side of profit and of wages. The fact that it is a gamble makes many a capitalist go broke and leads many a worker into sorrow. It is more than a mere unscientific system because you are gambling with human life and that is something which an ethical people cannot allow when it is not necessary. The intelligence of the scien-

tific world refuses any longer to support an unscientific system and demands that we shall combine our powers of co-ordination. We will no longer send our ships out to sea and take a blind chance that the waters will be kind and bring the ship safely back into port; we first find out what science has to say about the weather. So we must not send our workers into the industrial world to receive what the blind laws of supply and demand shall bring them. The intelligence of the modern world must bring itself to this task. It is shocked by the idea that labour is a commodity to be bought and sold in the open market just the same as any other material, to be bought at the lowest price and sold at the highest. The contention of labour and the fundamental contention of the Carpenter is that life is never a commodity, that life is never a thing to be bought and sold. The conscience of mankind in answer to that teaching has forever swept out of the world chattel slavery and sometime it is going to sweep out of the world wage slavery. For when men must work under conditions to which they do not consent, when they must work under conditions which they abhor, that fact is a fact of slavery. When they are driven by necessity and hunger and by the organisation of life to work under conditions to which they do not consent and when those condi-

tions might be removed and changed by a more intelligent organisation of the industrial system, that fact is a fact which cannot be consented to by the conscience that has been trained in the school of Jesus.

There is something else here, in the wage system; there is a wrong relationship between the two parties concerned. They are trying to buy and sell labour, and the best you can do with collective bargaining is to put the two parties on a nearly equal basis of strength down behind the same table to determine the terms of the bargain. The result is either an armed truce, perhaps to the detriment of the rest of the community, or it is worked out on the same basis that all trade is carried on and the party who is the most skilled is the party which will take the advantage. "To the victor belong the spoils." It is a battle principle, and the ethics that Jesus taught insists that this is a wrong relationship between man and man. One whose eyes have been opened can never believe that the only ultimate settlement of this question is that two groups should sit around a table and see which is the stronger in driving the better bargain. The ethics of Jesus insists that men should sit down not as antagonists, not as bargain drivers, but as brothers, co-workers in the joint work of the world. When you put men into that funda-

mental relationship, then they seek to do justice to each other and not to take advantage of each other. And the demand of Christian ethics is that ultimately all parties to the industrial process should be put in this relationship of trying to determine, not how each may take advantage of the other, but how best they all together may serve the common good, and be rewarded according to their service.

Q. Is it possible to make any arrangement whereby capital can possibly receive an interest return generally of even two cents on the dollar?

A. Practically that thing is being done all the time. Ethically, it is impossible.

Q. Ought one to patronise Five and Ten Cent Stores in view of the wages paid their clerks?

A. No man can be the guardian of another man's conscience, but anybody who has the kind of a conscience I have been talking about ought to keep away from all stores that are paying starvation wages.

Q. If a man now earning $9 a week, with a family, should come to you for advice, this man being interested in social betterment, what would you advise him to do?

A. I do not know anything that man can do except, on the one hand, to endeavour to increase his individual economic efficiency so that he may try and get a larger wage under the present system; and, on the other hand, to put all his power into the collective efforts of his fellow-workers to improve the general conditions.

Q. Have not we too much education? Oughtn't we to have more intelligence and common-sense?

A. What we need is more common-sense education.

Q. Would not the coming of the Millennium be hastened if your lectures were used as a text-book, with all references to the Bible cut out?

A. Well, I got the inspiration for my lectures out of the Bible.

Q. Would it be advisable to merge the House and Senate into one legislative body and take away their income and use that income for the relief of the unemployed?

A. I think we could even extend that proposition and do without the services of a great many more of our so-called legislators for a while.

Q. Is the money system and the wage system synonymous? What substitution would you give for money?

A. They are not synonymous. Of course, I am in this fortunate position, that I do not have to suggest practical plans, but I have to inculcate principles and I leave the difficult parts of the job to somebody else, and I think the most practical suggestion I have seen in a long while in that direction is in a pamphlet, "The Mechanics of Socialism," which you can secure at the headquarters of the Boston Fabian Club.

VI. VIOLENCE AND ITS CAUSES

ANARCHISM OF VARIOUS KINDS

THE strongest criticism that is levied against the labour movement by those who are not in touch with it concerns its use of violence. It is condemned in the sacred name of law and order, and law and order are, of course, fundamental to any organised community. Usually the criticisms of labour concerning its violence rest on two misconceptions. There still lingers in the minds of many people the mistaken notion that anarchism and socialism are, if not identical, at least connected. In the early days of the labour movement in Europe it was composed of a number of disconnected groups, and the policy was therefore more or less chaotic. Among those groups there was the group of Terrorists who promoted the propaganda of the deed, and strange to say they achieved most success in Spain and in this country. But very soon two groups very different in tactics and philosophy crystallised and the struggle went on between them for the control of the labour movement. These groups were the anarchists and the Marxian socialists.

A renewal of that conflict is carried out in the recent development of syndicalism in Europe. Again the same battle has been fought; again the victory has been with the socialist tactics, and the anarchist group in Europe are losing their latest battle.

Another misconception that prevails is that organised labour is a sponsor of violence, attempting to accomplish its ends by the use of physical force, particularly in its coercion of the non-union man. That is not the policy of the trade union movement of any country. All reputable leaders of the trade union movement not only disavow violence for public consumption, but sincerely and strongly oppose it within the labour movement. That this is an honest judgment may be seen from the fact that violence decreases with the spread of labour organisations. There is much less violence now than in the early days of the labour movement. There has always been more violence connected with spontaneous strikes of unorganised workers than with the strikes conducted by labour organisations. In those countries where trade union organisations have grown to the largest strength, where they are recognised by the employers and by the courts, there is the least violence. In Australia and New Zealand where the belief in collective bargaining is very strong you find

scarcely a trace of violence. In this country you will find violence strongest where trade unions are weakest; and in those trades where trade unions are the oldest, where they have the most power, you will find, generally speaking, the least violence. You can take the coal mines: In those States where the operators recognise the rights of collective bargaining, you have a long history of the peaceful conduct of the coal mining industry, both to the advantage of the operators and the States.

Now, notwithstanding all this, violence does occur in the labour movement, and violence is sometimes abvocated by local labour leaders. Where you have a policy of desperation owing to the break-down of organisation in a trade, where you have the desperate fighting of the rat in the corner, there you will find violence, as in the McNamara case. Aside from that exceptional case I know of no instance in the American labour movement when violence has been propagated by national union leaders. It is sometimes fostered by local trade union leaders.

There are some reasons why we have more sporadic violence in the United States than in other countries aside from the question of the individualistic nature of our government. One reason for that is the American spirit. We are law-makers and law-breakers beyond any other

people on the face of the earth. As Kipling said when writing of the American spirit, first we make the law we flout, and then we flout the law we make. There is no one of us but what is breaking continually more or less the statutes that we know nothing about which are on our statute books, and that breeds a disrespect and even a contempt for the law. It goes further than that. We have the anarchist attitude of the officials who are sworn to enforce the laws and who do not enforce them but who continually before the eyes of the whole people violate their oath of office. It is not very long, is it, since in Boston a high official advocated, concerning the utterances of a man with whom he did not agree, that he should be run out of town? Now beside the anarchy of officials of the law, which is, of course, the very disruption of the State, labour is educated also into disrespect for the law by the attitude of capital toward the law. Labour sees capital making the law, and as labour goes more and more into political action it finds the capitalist lobbies at the legislature and sees how they work. It even has seen the National Manufacturers' Association operating at Washington, and the whole public has had opportunity to trace the reaching out of that influence over the very courts themselves. Capital is continually teaching labour to have little respect for the law.

When capital does not control the making of the law, it hires its expensive attorneys to find means to evade the law.

I am offering neither defence nor apology, but I am showing reasons, and if you want to stop violence in the labour movement and if you want to establish respect for the law the first step is to make capital keep the law; and, in my judgment, if you can make capital keep the law, the amount of trouble you will have from labour will be negligible.

Now there are other more general reasons lying back of this situation. You can trace the development of violence in the world-wide labour movement according to a certain definite law. It proceeds in proportion to the tyranny of governments, in proportion to the opposition of employers to labour movements, and in proportion also to the ignorance, helplessness and desperation of the workers. There is a law that birds and animals throw out certain defensive weapons in response to certain needs of protection. And in the same way if we trace the world-wide development of the labour movement do we find these weapons of defence being thrown out in response to certain needs of protection. And the weapon of defence becomes before long the weapon of offence and aggression. The fundamental reason for what violence there is in the labour move-

ment is because industry is yet organised on the war basis. All your local outbreaks are simply the outcome of the war spirit that lies at the centre. As Lincoln said concerning the situation before the Civil War, "there is an irreconcilable antagonism at the heart of it."

THE STRIKE AND THE "SCAB"

Now what about the local violence of the labour movement? What about the violence of strike conflicts? And it ought to be recognised of course, in passing, that no struggle for human rights has ever been won in history without violence. That, again, is no apology, no defence, no justification. It is the statement of a fact, and along with that goes this other fact, that the rights for which labour is struggling are just as fundamental as any of the great civil rights for which men have struggled in the past and that so far that struggle for industrial justice and freedom has been accompanied by less violence than has the strife for political justice and civil freedom.

There is, first, the violence against property, and second, the violence against person. The violence against property in a strike is of two kinds. It is that which is emotional, the mere outburst of passion and of mob spirit, that occurs when there has been an adequate reason of injus-

tice to stir the mob spirit. Such a thing as occurred here at Lawrence when the men opened their pay envelopes and found without note or warning that their wages had been cut. Such violence as occurred at a later stage in that strike, when the people who were trying to break the strike saw they could not make any headway against the peaceful picketing of the strikers, and as they marched around the building singing their songs they turned a stream of icy water from the hose upon them on that cold winter's day and thus created the violence which gave them an excuse for bringing the militia to protect their property. A similar development of violence you find in Colorado when there was violence against the property of the mine owners after Ludlow and not before, *after* the miners had been wrought up to a pitch of frenzied hostility by the death of their women and their children and the destruction of their tent colonies.

You also find some violence that is incited today, that is not emotional, but is produced by an educational process — produced by foolish speeches, speeches that often perhaps are not intended to produce that result. The syndicalist teaches a sabotage, which is to put the machine out of commission but must not destroy it. But the average worker on a low wage is not accustomed to philosophic statements; he is easily

incited to destroy the machine after such teaching as that, and so you get a result that was not intended by the speaker but which is the natural result of teaching doctrines which have a philosophic subtlety not to be comprehended by the people of the street. Then you have another kind of violence that is incited by capital, the destruction of property that is done for the sake of putting the blame upon the workers. There was dynamite planted in Lawrence for this purpose, and also in Los Angeles after the blowing up of the Times Building. I have myself in the last few weeks received positive first-hand evidence concerning one of the historic occasions in the labour movements of this country when property was destroyed, and in this instance life was taken with it. I have it right from men who paid to have it done that this violence was committed to have something to put over upon the labour organisations before the courts. There is a regular business also of furnishing spies to become members of labour organisations. I have first-hand knowledge of that, too, and I have had the honour of being reported upon by the spies that are maintained in certain industrial corporations. You have the testimony before the Industrial Commission, men admitting that they hired private detectives and paid them to work in their plants in order that they might spy on their fellow-workers,

Many of the deeds of violence in American labour struggles were done by those secret agents, and we need to understand their part in making bloody history. Nobody knows how large a part of the destruction charged to labour organisation should be charged to these spies. As for this whole spy business in American industry, I want here to record my deliberate conviction that those men who cannot manage industry without the use of spies have thereby proved their moral and industrial unfitness to manage industry.

Then, there is the violence against person that accompanies the strike. There are two kinds of this violence, the emotional outbreak of the mob and the deliberate policy of the educational commission to discourage the non-union man or the strike-breaker. Of course there is no such revulsion against the use of a little physical force on the part of the men who are close to the fundamentals of life as there is in the refined and educated group. That needs to be taken into account. Labour uses a great deal of physical violence within its own family. Men who live close to the fundamentals of life, who pursue hazardous occupations, find that life counts but little, that capital and state care little about their lives. And you must remember that the refined and cultivated group perform their violence just as effectively, but in other ways. A labour man

who does not want you to take his job may discourage you with fist, or the brick-bat, or a piece of lead-pipe; but the capitalist who wants to take away your job comes up behind and slugs you over the head with a million dollars, but he slugs you just as effectively. You may get over the headache of the man who slugs you in the head, but your family will be a long time getting over the injury inflicted by the capitalist. Both sides here cannot see the other fellow fairly for the beam that is in their own eye. But some of us who are standing in an impartial attitude must see the thing as it is and must recognise that the violence of labour, open and brutal, and the violence of capital, subtle and refined, are one and the same thing, that both alike are fundamentally wrong and that both can have no permanent part in a democratic industrial community.

Of course you know of the violence of the mob spirit, when the mob chases the scab, and that is not anything separate from the general mob spirit. It does not matter what men chase, whether it is a rabbit or a man, if once they get started to chase anything they lose everything except mad passion. In labour struggles that mad passion belongs not simply to labour but to the whole community. You will find that the hatred of the scab extends far beyond the limits of the trade organisation. To the whole labour

group that man is a traitor. From their standpoint they view him just the same as the trade organisation views the price cutter or the professional organisation (doctors, lawyers, ministers, etc.) regards the man who violates the rules of that profession. He is not simply a grafter from their point of view, but he is also a traitor, and a traitor in war-time. When war is in the atmosphere passion rises, and when you get war in an industrial community you get all the fever and passion of men rising to their height against this man who is a traitor in war-time. There is a group that is paid to break strikes, that expects to do it by fighting. And the whole community, the very children of the community, will join, in the spirit of persecution, against these traitors.

But back of all that, is of course the spirit of coercion, and the ethics of labour justify coercion toward the undemocratic anarchistic individual, insists that social welfare as well as the good of the labour group justifies coercion toward him. The reasoning is sound and the ethics are correct, only when that is extended to the whole community, when the majority in the community are convinced of the right to use coercion toward any individuals who are promoting a socially harmful policy. That right of coercion does not exist in any minority in the community. It must first convince a majority. You have to deal with it in

the whole industrial situation. You have coercion exerted against labour as well as on the behalf of labour, and if you are going to remove the spirit of coercion from one side of the labour question, you have to remove it from the other.

THE "GUNMEN"

Another great cause of violence in the organised labour movement, especially in recent disputes, is the employment of the gunmen ostensibly for protecting property, but really for the purpose of prolonging strikes. These gunmen are the death-ravens of the industrial battlefield. They have been used in Colorado and West Virginia and New Jersey. But they found New Jersey different from Colorado and now they are in jail to answer for their apparently unprovoked attack on unarmed workers. The immediate cause of the extreme violence of recent labour disputes has been the brutality of these gunmen. From the history of these situations I have found that the first serious acts of violence were committed by those men and led to corresponding acts of violence on the part of the labour group, against whom those first acts had been committed. It was back in the 60's when this traffic began when Pinkerton started his famous detective agency, and now there are a number of them, several hundreds of them, I think, about the coun-

try, principally engaged in furnishing spies and guards and strike-breakers to industrial corporations. One detective agency offers to furnish unlimited forces for $5 a day, with transportation. This great business amounts to the supplying of private feudal armies to capital. It is a reversion to the old feudalistic policy when the barons had their private retainers. It was as late as 1826 that England finally replaced the private forces of the aristocracy with the civic and state police, and now here in this country we have reverted to that feudalistic system.

What is the history and character of the men? One of the greatest detectives of England is on record after investigating the thing in this country as saying that 90 per cent. of these agencies are fraudulent. William J. Burns, who ought to know, says that as a class these agencies are the biggest lot of blackmailing thieves that ever went unwept to justice. Other testimony is on record by men who know concerning the character of the people who are enlisted in these private armies (and I have some first-hand knowledge of my own on that fact also), that they are for the most part ex-convicts, criminals, and denizens of the slums, with a sprinkling, since the business has developed into warfare on a general scale, of soldiers of fortune, ex-soldiers who fight anywhere under any flag for the sake of adventure. Their busi-

ness is to commit assaults and even to kill union men. They are hired to protect property but they are used to break the strike, and that is what they sell themselves for. In Colorado and in West Virginia they planned attacks on the labour forces on the same scale as modern warfare. They even have been known time and time again to commit widespread violence in order on the one hand to maintain their own profitable job and on the other hand to discredit the strikers. This is true concerning the Colorado strikes and the railroad strikes of the 90's. In one case, at least, the testimony is clear that the violence was committed by the agents of these private detective agencies, who even went so far as to identify themselves by a certain sign so that when the militia came into action they would not suffer, but the strikers. I am talking history now and nobody's opinions.

"This reprehensible system is responsible for much of the ill-feeling and the bad blood displayed by the working class," says the Pennsylvania State Commission after the first outbreak occasioned by such agencies in the Homestead strike of 1892. Commission after commission and judge after judge have so expressed themselves in this country, yet that business still goes on and even extends itself, and the only shadow of excuse for it is, that property must be protected. In

every other civilised State the protection of property is kept in the hands of the State and not in the hands of private forces maintained by private individuals. There is no safety for any of us if that system is allowed to continue. It is an indisputable spot of shame and disgrace upon American industrial history, and it is high time and more than time that this interstate commerce in crime and death be absolutely and forever prohibited in this country.

THE MILITIA

But you say that then the militia must come in and the attitude of the workers towards the militia is no different than the attitude towards the gunmen. In Colorado when the militia first came in the strikers went to meet them with a brass band, thinking that the militia would protect them from the brutality and criminality of the gunmen. Later their attitude changed entirely toward the militia. Faith in the militia is not simply destroyed, but the militia is becoming to be hated in the labour movement, because labour believes (and the records show), that in most cases the militia has been used not impartially to enforce the laws of the State but on the side of capital to break the strike. The testimony of a militia man who served out at Lawrence (and it is on record), is to the effect that they

went out there to protect property and to serve one side. He said: "It was so understood; we accepted favours from one side and never a word was said to us concerning the rights of the other side." That is almost inevitable when you remember the social and official associations of the officers of the militia with the group of employers. It takes a good man to save himself from being influenced by his friends. And with the best will in the world the militia usually drifts into the service of one side. In Colorado it even went so far as to enlist in the militia the gunmen who were being paid by the private operators.

If that danger can be avoided, yet we still have this peril, the peril of martial law, which has become a bitter fact in this country. It began in Colorado in 1903. The state officials informed the operators that they could have the services of the militia if they would pay the expenses.

The militia should be used to establish law and order if the need is there, but to put state troops at the services of one party to a conflict if they will pay the bill is another matter. The constitution of Colorado says that the military power must always be subordinate to the civil power. Out there this military force refused to obey the laws of the State. They denied the right of habeas corpus. They denied the right of free speech, and they made a mine manager official

censor for the State of Colorado in that section at that time. Since then we have had martial law declared by military officers in Colorado and in West Virginia without any regard as to whether the facts justified martial law, for martial law under our constitution is only justified when the civil power is inoperative. But in each case they put martial law into operation arbitrarily and all the fundamental rights of American citizens, the rights for which blood has been shed in the past, were denied by military officers. You had men thrown into jail under sentence by military tribunals. You had other men thrown into jail without any charge of any kind brought against them and held in jail for months. Judge Cullen of the New York Supreme Court has said that if this process was to continue there was not a single right granted to the citizens of this country which they could enjoy and use. We are facing here the possibility of the very breakdown of the republic. If you are to have militarism expressing itself at the centre of our industrial communities, you have no guarantee for the future of your republic.

You ought to remember that sooner or later labour is going to have the controlling voice in the commonwealth, and I ask you this, What is going to happen in that day if labour has been taught by a process of military dictatorship that

the constitutional rights of citizens can be superseded by arbitrary authority? You say property must be protected by the State. It must be. Property must be protected. But there is not a case where I have not found that the destruction of property was preceded by something vastly more significant, the destruction of life. The destruction of human life in the industrial world has been the occasion for the destruction of property. And is the state to maintain a brutal armed force, for the sake of men who have no regard for the vital human fabric of the State?

When the State considers that its first duty, more fundamental even than the protection of property, is the protection of human life, it will not have to concern itself with the protection of property, for that will take care of itself. And the State that will develop itself constructively to protect and develop human life will not have to adopt repressive measures for the protection of property. That is the way out of the situation, and it is the only way out. In the last analysis neither the State nor industry can rest upon the constraint of force, and the attempt to use force by either side in the industrial struggle is a confession that justice and reason have not been tried, or will not avail. In the last analysis both industry and the State can rest on no other ground than the ground of reason.

Q. What do you think of Dr. Eliot's definition of a strike-breaker?

A. I think that Dr. Eliot, like a good many of the rest of us college professors, is talking about something he does not understand very well.

Q. Would not the Swiss military order be worth having in this country?

A. Well, if you have got to have any that would be perhaps the least objectionable. I do not think you have to have any in this country.

Q. If the Socialist belief that property should be enjoyed by its products is logical, why should not the machine which is destroying life be destroyed?

A. Both to-day and the other day I thought I made myself clear. If a machine is destroying folks that is not a reason for destroying the machine, but that is a reason for stopping the destruction of the machine and harnessing it up to social welfare.

Q. Can labour unions themselves offset the results of the acts of strike-breakers by themselves organising a force?

A. I was in a manufacturing town last year where during a strike twenty union men were held responsible for order and for the protection

of property. There was no violence or destruction of property in that town.

Q. Can the speaker give us any information as to the influence of women as evidenced in Colorado?

A. They did one thing. They compelled the putting of the situation up to Washington and the bringing in of the Federal troops to replace both the gunmen and the state police.

Q. What part have the newspapers played in these industrial controversies?

A. In several outstanding instances they have misled the public by reports that were untrue and by reports that were biassed and only half true, and the reason for that, of course, is the association of the news gathering agency locally with the employing groups. The news comes to the reporter from that side with which he is associated, and that is the side he turns out.

Q. In view of the fact that a scab is himself a worker and supports himself and family, is it fair for the union to hold the scab as it does?

A. If a man is consciously and deliberately putting his own self-interest, his own little comfort up above the good of a whole group or a whole class, he is a traitor to the common good. It is not a question of his being a traitor to the union.

Q. If the law and the constitution are being used to destroy the rights of labour, why do you say that labour should regard the law and constitution?

A. My statement was that the danger was that labour should come to disregard constitutional rights. Law can be used to defend labour. It can be used to defend the destruction of labour, but of course the fundamental rights of any group can only be worked out by itself.

Q. I wonder if professors even think or remember that their good salaries are often, and generally come very largely, from the hand-labour of business men and manufacturers? I could show you that manufacturers have a hard time, with taxes increasing annually, and all kinds of troubles. Men do not do as much in eight hours as in nine. They always do the very least possible and have no mercy on their employers. No fool manufacturer can make both ends meet. They require brains, real brains. Investigate a little and you will know more than you now do.

A. If we were inclined to forget that first fact, we should be constantly reminded of it, and we are. But we remember this fact also. We remember that the money that supports us comes not only from the managers of industry, but from the workers in industry. And we remember therefore that we are under obligations to both

of them, and God helping us will discharge that obligation to both of them to the best of our ability. I do have plenty of sympathy with the manufacturers. They have demands of labour on one side of them and the control of capital with its demands on the other side of them, and if we have any message for anybody we have a message for them, that they shall use all the powers they have in joining with labour in transforming matters. In regard to men doing the least possible and having no mercy on their employers, of course that man has investigated just his own business. He has not gone far enough. I have learned this to be a fundamental rule of life, whether it is in teaching or preaching or in industry, you get back from men the same attitude with which you face them. If you try to skin them, they will try to skin you, and if you try to treat them with justice and appreciation, they will respond in the same spirit to you.

VII. LABOR AND THE LAW

This is not a technical discussion. It is simply an attempt to present broadly the case of labour against the law, from the standpoint of an observer who will be impartial if he can and who is entirely unversed in the subtlety of legal technicalities.

Labour's first contact with the law is usually at the business end of a policeman's club. It concerns the right to picket. The usual instructions to pickets are that they shall proceed singly, or in pairs, with their hands in their pockets, shall keep moving and shall use nothing but speech. Well, the best of instructions are not always carried out, and while peaceful picketing is recognised by the courts and laws of a good many cities and states, picketing does, of course, often lead to disturbance, and that is where the law may properly step in. But in determining where the disturbance begins you have to look for it inside the zone of discretionary enforcement of the law at the hands of officials. Oftentimes the right of peaceful picketing is denied and violence is provoked by the police. In the city of Paterson in 1913 the local papers

which were bitterly opposed to both the strike and its leaders, admitted and even claimed with pride that there had been less violence in that strike than in any strike of its size in the history of this country. Yet there were during that strike 1200 arrests and 300 punishments for picketing, which led a more or less conservative New York journal to liken that prosecuting attorney and district judge to Jeffreys and his famous hanging sheriff.

Now there are other groups interested in the arbitrary and unconstitutional exercise of police power. Those groups interested in moral reform constantly come against that obstacle, and it would be well for both them and labour if they would join forces and resist with equal vehemence the unconstitutional exercise of police authority. When the police in Chicago found that by mistake they had Miss Starr in jail for no crime at all but peaceful picketing they were in great haste to let her go. They found they had burned their fingers. But she would not be let go. And if the same treatment that is accorded to labour for peaceful picketing were accorded to people in what is sometimes erroneously supposed to be the higher walks of society, we should have a good many more disturbances than we now have.

When labour appears in court it faces the same

arbitrary use of prerogative, in this case exercised by the judiciary. It faces the injunction; it faces the right of the judge to make the law, interpret the law and determine the punishment — the right which has been taken from the executive and legal departments of the government and which cannot be allowed to remain in the judiciary branch of the government. Does anybody believe for a moment that a jury of their peers, fairly drawn, would have sentenced Gompers and Mitchell to jail for publishing that "We don't patronise" list? And when one considers from what class of society judges come — with no imputation of their sincerity — when one considers that practically their whole associations have been with one side of this labour controversy, what justice can you have when an injunction prerogative with the power to punish is left in the hands of the judge in labour cases? It may be legal etiquette to write injunctions in the office of the attorney for the plaintiff, but when that is done in labour cases the outcome works a great injustice for labour. The fundamental principles of the English law, according to an authority of this city, is that the judge is simply the voice of the jury — (that is, in certain groups of cases) — that it is not his province to take out of the hands of the jury the fundamental disposition of the accused, and the attempt to

assume that right is contrary to the development of English Civil and Criminal Procedure. That attempt must be strongly resisted by all lovers of liberty. The fundamental principle of the right to be tried by a jury of one's peers where one's life or liberty is held in peril through violation of the law is a right which every other group, as much as labour, is interested in defending.

When labour comes into court before a jury the trouble is it does not very often face a jury of its peers. Packed juries do exist. The attorney-general of the last administration made accusation to the President concerning the activities of one of those private detective agencies in influencing juries. Even where juries are honestly drawn, with the present class struggle and class conflict you do not always get a jury of your peers. That phrase had a distinct meaning when it originated in feudal times. Would a baron submit to trial by a jury of serfs? See what happened in the French Revolution when the class that had long been subjected to class punishment got control of the courts and laws in their own hands. And those people who are interested now in days of class conflict and class struggle in administering the law from the standpoint of class interest might stop to remember what will happen, if that policy be persisted in, when cap-

ital comes into court to be accused by a labour district attorney, to be tried by a labour judge, and sentenced by a labour jury.

THE BOYCOTT

Labour has a controversy with the law over the question of the boycott. Now the boycott is an ancient weapon. It was used in this country, in this State, by the Sons and Daughters of Liberty against British goods. It has been used by employers against union labour. It has been used by trade associations against members who cut prices. I have even known it to be advocated against preachers. I have in my possession a copy of a letter by the secretary of one of the state manufacturers' associations in this country which calls upon its members to cease supporting preachers who talk against the interests of that association. There is the positive boycott, the boycott that is turned around and used the other way, the consumers' label and the union label which constrains its members to trade with one another. The boycott in the sense of its use by labour though usually means either a simple abstention from dealing with another member, and the endeavour to persuade others so to abstain. That is the primary boycott and it is usually held legal by our courts unless it involves violence. Then there is the secondary boycott which endeav-

ours to induce others to abstain from dealings with certain parties by using coercive or intimidating measures, and that has usually been held illegal, although the Supreme Court of California declines to make any distinction between the primary and the secondary boycott unless the element of coercion comes in. England and Germany have long recognised the boycott as a legal privilege of trade unions. In this country the ground of action against the boycott as voiced by the United States Supreme Court in its decisions against the boycott, that is, such a boycott as was used in the Danbury Hatters' case, is that it publishes certain facts, to the detriment of the property or the good name of another person, and therefore the courts have held that the right of free speech and free press ought to be abridged. In one notorious case the dissenting judge voiced this opinion: He said, "The court has no such power" — that is, to abridge free speech and free press in order to protect property rights.— "It is a fact that practically all of the encroachment upon the rights of property up to date have been made by the courts themselves, the sworn defenders of the Constitution." And when we remember that no government has ever long survived the denial of the right of free speech and free press, if there is any of the spirit of '76 left in this country there will be some other

people ready to go to jail along with labour in defence of those fundamental rights.

You have a social question here as well as one that concerns the interests of labour. Suppose the facts which ought to be printed and spoken are facts which the public must know? Suppose they are facts concerning the adulteration of food or fabric? Suppose they are facts concerning the destruction of the very fabric of society, the injury of the life of the workers? Must not the public know those facts? Is not such knowledge superior to any injury which might accrue to the property or reputation of those who have been doing this to the injury of the commonwealth? And those who care for a safe and sound social progress will defend here the right of publication in the proper manner of all facts which are socially necessary to be known.

It has been found in England and Germany that the use of the boycott has diminished with its legalising. The same result would surely follow in this country. If it be not legalised, it will be used secretly in a much more dangerous fashion, even as the black-list is used. The black-list is permitted by law even more than the boycott, and yet the black-list is used more frequently in this country than the boycott is used. The white-list can be used just as effectively. Labour recognises the possibilities of the unjust

use of the boycott in righting injustice, and its leaders have spoken against its unjust use. There have been few cases in recent industrial uses where it has been used for any other reason than to right injustice. In one case where a person was boycotted the trade of the person attacked was increased rather than diminished by the unjust and unfair use of the boycott. The abuse of the boycott can be met and suppressed under the existing criminal law. And if it be legalised in a proper manner it will result in a much better type of industrial struggle than will prevail under its suppression.

CONSPIRACY

The boycott like many other labor measures is sometimes proceeded against on the ground of conspiracy, and here again is labour's controversy with the law. The common law against conspiracy was used in England originally against all labour organisations. They were held to be unlawful, but in 1875 England legalised trade unions and took them out from under the conspiracy laws. But in this country we have still persisted in the doctrine that an act which is lawful when performed by one individual becomes unlawful when performed by a group acting in a concerted manner. Several States have modified the common law conspiracy doc-

trine in relation to labour organisations. Yet when two States have by statute declared that offences not indictable singly are not indictable when done in concert, there have been recent attempts to extend the law of conspiracy. It has been so extended in the recent decision in the Danbury Hatters' case notwithstanding the fact that the records at Washington show that it was the purpose of those who drew that law that it should not apply to labour organisations. In West Virginia and in Colorado indictments have been drawn against the officers of the United Miners for conspiracy in restraint of trade. But the most daring attempt to extend the law of conspiracy to labour is in a recent case in Texas where some I. W. W. men were tried on a conspiracy charge because of a riot which grew out of some speeches which some of them had made while others had not been present at the meetings. The prosecuting attorney took the ground that the law of conspiracy held a man responsible for acts done by an organisation to which he belonged even though he was not present when they were done, and even though they were contrary to the expressed purpose of the organisation for which he had joined it. A part of labour's case against the court is that justice sometimes depends upon whether you have money to defend you or not. Those men who were tried in that

case had no money for a lawyer and so the prosecuting attorney got by with his charge and they were given, I think, fifteen or eighteen years each. But when the next group came into the court their fellow-workers had provided for a lawyer. Those men went to jail for three and six months.

Now the legal mind will have hard work to convince the common-sense mind that things which are right when done singly are wrong when done collectively. That is simply an outworn theory of a purely feudalistic period of civilisation. To-day group action, collective action, is compulsory, and the question which has been raised by one of our labour journals concerning the recent attempt to extend the law of conspiracy needs to be answered. "What about the conspiracy of those who thus conspire to use the law of conspiracy?" Those who are trying to limit collective action, to administer the laws of earlier and simpler days so as to check and hinder proper action for the improvement of social conditions, are not simply conspiring to persecute and oppress labour, they are interfering with the proper development of social progress. And the peril of their course is that if approved and persisted in by those who have their hands upon the laws and the courts, it leaves as the only available method to remove the obstruction, the undesirable method of physical force.

FREEDOM OF CONTRACT

Labour's next controversy with the law concerns the ancient doctrine of freedom of contract, and that is, of course, the chief bar to the enforcement of labour legislation. The doctrine of freedom of contract has been used to nullify labour laws in State after State. It has been used to nullify laws prohibiting company stores. It has been used to throw out laws protecting the health of women from over-labour. On that ground a law prohibiting the night work of women, which has been prohibited in Europe for years, was declared unconstitutional in New York State. It has been used to declare unconstitutional laws for the health of the workers, "safety-first laws," and also employers' liability laws. All these have been checked in this country, hindered and held back by this doctrine of freedom of contract. In the State of Illinois, regarding the second ten-hour law there, two working women came into court to indicate that the law forbidding them to work more than ten hours was unconstitutional. One testified that she had worked for a certain firm, which of course really brought the suit, for thirty-two years, and after thirty-two years of labour (and she was the most efficient worker in the room), she could not earn enough to support herself and sister without

working more than ten hours a day. Freedom of contract might be constitutional if it simply meant freedom to destroy one's self, but freedom, in the doing of that, to destroy a whole labour group is impossible. There is now a case before the Supreme Court of the United States trying to declare unconstitutional the minimum wage law in the State of Oregon on the doctrine of freedom of contract, and the plaintiffs advance the novel statement that low wages have nothing whatever to do with health and morals.

This doctrine of freedom of contract is written into our Constitution, but the Constitution of the United States was written at a time when the whole civilised world was reacting against feudalism, when the swing of the pendulum had carried both law and philosophy to the most absurd extreme of individualism, when even preachers were holding that it was too bad that children should be destroyed in the factories, but that all you could do was to pray the good God to take them out of life as quickly as possible. And in addition to the reaction of Europe against the constraint of feudalism we had the pioneer spirit here reacting against the suppressions of the Colonial period. At that time in this country, and at the very time when industrialism was forcing Europe away from the *laissez faire* philosophy, at that time freedom of contract was

rigidly written into constitutional form here. But what was then a philosophic doctrine is absolutely contrary now to economic fact. There is no freedom of contract to-day for the individual worker in those industries which are highly capitalised and concentrated. Freedom of contract is purely a legal fiction to-day. As Mrs. Robins says, "Every one, except judges and lawyers, knows that freedom of contract can exist only between parties on an economic equality." As long as you have economic inequality, you have economic restraint. Economic restraint is a fact, and it is more powerful to-day in certain groups of society than any other kind of restraint. Now you can lessen that economic restraint by legal restraint, and when you lessen economic restraint by legal restraint instead of interfering with freedom of contract you are giving a direct expression of freedom of contract and individual liberty. It is shown both in matters of short hour legislation and liability legislation, in the doctrine of the interference of the police power for social welfare that freedom of contract is thoroughly established now in the courts. Economic restraint received its death blow with the United States Supreme Court decision concerning the ten hour law in Oregon, and since then we have had decision of state courts on short hour legislation, which simply shot that old doc-

trine so full of holes that nobody but a corporation lawyer can recognise it. It must be recognised that freedom of contract, individual liberty, is subordinate to social welfare and that only by so subordinating it can you attain the highest degree of individual freedom and liberty.

PROPERTY RIGHTS VS. HUMAN RIGHTS

The question of freedom of contract bridges into still another question, and that is the question of the whole legal status of property, the comparative status before the law of human rights and property rights. Labour's fundamental case against the law is not so much with the administration and interpretation of the law as it is with the law itself. We may have to deal with ancient judges still holding to outworn philosophy, but that is not the significant situation. We may have to deal with judge-made laws at the hands of judges whose whole association and whose whole sympathies have been with the capitalist and the employing group rather than with the labour group, and who notwithstanding all their sincerity and honesty are nevertheless influenced by their associations and their sympathies as well as by their ignorance of the facts of the situation. But we have something more fundamental still. There is a different status before the court in most cases for property than for

human rights. That appears over and over again. As one of our legal authorities has said, "the legal attitude toward pressure exerted by business corporations for familiar ends of acquisition is very different from that toward pressure exerted by the union for the novel end of a standard of living."

So far the courts have held the right of free speech as less important than property rights. In other words, the life of the worker who is trying to protect himself by publishing certain facts counts for less with the court than the right of property to protect itself. The extreme of that, of course, was the decision in New York rendering unconstitutional the workmen's compensation law on the ground that it was taking away the property of the employer without due process of law. The Constitution says that no man's life, liberty, or property shall be destroyed without due process of law, and yet in all the decisions of the courts there is no instance where that clause in the Constitution has been invoked to protect the life and liberty of the worker. Take that situation, which is simply a survival of feudalistic times, where the governor can himself call out the troops and declare a state of military law. Do you know where that most vital, that most supreme of all powers, do you know a case where

that has been used to protect the life and liberty of the workers? It has been used sometimes, as it must be used, to protect property. There have been cases where the life and liberty of the workers has been just as vitally injured as ever the property of the employers was and that supreme authority has never been used to protect it.

Come down to a concrete case and you get the same thing in more outstanding form. Here is a man over in New York who wrecks a business and along with it wrecks the savings of his employés, and he gets what — a fine, was it not? Here is a man in California who steals a dollar and he has gone to jail for five years for it. Now it isn't any use inveighing against the judge of the court, it is something fundamentally wrong with the law here that we have to deal with. It is the very conception of the law itself. Here are some workers out in a Western State who deported some people whom they thought undesirable citizens, and they have gone to jail for kidnapping. But there are cases right here where employers have deported by physical force labour leaders whom they considered undesirable citizens, but they have not been found guilty of kidnapping and I have not seen the legal process invoked to that end. The United States government used all the power at its command (as it properly

should have used it), in hunting down everybody concerned with that conspiracy of violence that was concocted at Indianapolis in the Structural Iron Workers' Union and the packed juries of Colorado (the evidence is before the commission, it is not my word you have to take for it, that there were packed juries in Colorado just the same as the packed grand jury of Calumet) have been indicting labour leader after labour leader for violence and conspiracy and so discrediting them before the whole public, but I have not seen the machinery of the law, either state or Federal, called into action to hunt down and trace out those who planned the conspiracy of violence and assault upon the miners of Colorado.

This fundamental difference before the law is responsible almost entirely for labour's attitude toward the law, and the peril of the situation is that the attitude increasingly becomes one of distrust and hostility. In a Western state an I. W. W. leader was before the court for contempt, on the charge that on the street he had made a speech and said, "To hell with the court and the judge." He came into court and the judge asked him if he wanted a lawyer. He said, "No, it would not be any use. You will do what you want to, anyway." At the end of the procedure the judge asked him, "Have you anything to say?" He said, "Yes, I have one thing to say.

Judge, I did not say on the street, 'To hell with the court!' The police testimony was all there was and the policeman lied, but," he said, "before you sentence me I want to stand up and say here before the press, To hell with such a court!"

Now the peril of that goes far. That spells menace for the future, and it is not, I repeat, the case of individual judges or individual courts, it is the case of the status of property as compared with life and labour before the court. It is the proposition that a great part of our law has been written to protect the property of the strong, who got it by force originally, whose only original title was that of force, and who have been strong enough to write the law to protect that property. That is why the ex-chancellor of England, one of the best legal minds in the world, said a thing which sounds most extreme to Europe. He said, "If I had my way I would hang all those responsible for the robbery of the property of other nations in the present war." He does not say a word about what he would do for those responsible for taking the millions of lives in this present war. It is your fundamental proposition there that has to be changed.

Now that status is going to be changed by one method or another, for the simple reason that the world is now coming to believe in a different philosophy of life. It has been believing that

property was worth more than human rights, but it is learning now that humanity must ever stand supreme above property. It is coming to a philosophy of human values and human rights that was not taught by those who dress in purple and live in kings' houses, not by those who court the favours of emperors and have the privileges of the rich, but the philosophy that was taught by one who worked with His hands. And the world that is coming to believe in that philosophy is going to change its law and its custom until the battle between the man and the dollar is won in favour of the man. The law which is more tender to property interest than to human rights is a reflection of an aristocratic state, a state of class privilege. It is a reflection, moreover, of the militaristic mind of that state which holds the great common crowd of folk subordinate to the group of luxury. But now we are creating a different kind of state, a state that never will enthrone a superior class in comfort and luxury with an inferior class at the bottom, a state that is organising its whole force and its whole life for the development of all its people on terms of equal opportunity. In such a state law will have this for its supreme function — it will be the expression of the will of the people to restrain those who would injure or destroy the vital property of

the state — the lives and welfare of the people who make the state and all its property, and without whom neither the state nor property has any meaning or existence.

Q. Is not highly paid labour wages taken from the unskilled and unorganised labourer?

A. Only in part. It comes from a number of other sources, too.

Q. Does not the recall of judges and the recall of decisions follow logically from your statement of to-day?

A. It does. In a democracy the supreme power must always be the will of the people.

Q. Does not the hope of labour's future depend upon the fact that they are developing a literature of their own?

A. It does very largely. The fact that labour is learning to think indicates that it is gaining capacity for action, but labour's literature must not be isolated from the currents of the world's intellectual life.

Q. Does not, in the last analysis, the police power of the State rest upon the working man inasmuch as it is the power of the people?

A. The police power of the State is, of course, the power of the majority, and if the working man is the majority, that is his power.

Q. If a workingman is called to serve upon a jury, should not he look at the case from the standpoint of the working class alone?

A. That is just the kind of dose you have been getting from the capitalist, and it won't do you

any good to turn that dose around. Look at everything from the standpoint of the widest social interest.

Q. The Constitution is a class document, and being a class document must it not be necessarily thrown overboard so far as economic law is concerned?

A. The Constitution was to a certain extent a class document, and it becomes more and more so as class distinctions deepen, and so far as what shall be done with it is concerned, I think the world will not stop because we tear a parchment more or less.

Q. Do you still advise us to obey the law, or are we to join with the man who said, "To hell with the law"?

A. It is a very different thing to take a general attitude toward all law and all courts and to refuse to obey an unjust court and an unjust law. I would never advise any man to obey any law or any court which he believed to be unjust.

Q. Is it not true that if you have recall of judges it will be the recall of the majority, and that there is danger in the fact that sometimes majorities are in the wrong?

A. We are always in danger as long as we are alive. The danger of the majority is offset in this way, that the minority can always become a majority.

Q. Is it not true that in labour cases Massachusetts decisions are superior in many ways to those of many other States?

A. I am not a lawyer and cannot speak with authority. However, I believe that the laws and the courts of Massachusetts have been, on the whole, more fair to labour than those of any other State.

Q. Is it not true that many of the justices of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts rose from the labour class?

A. Of that fact I have no knowledge, but in determining the sympathies of the person, that is, determining his attitude towards a class question, it is a matter not of income nor birth always; it is a matter of one's psychological and ethical point of view that determines the thing.

Q. Has the Governor of this State or any other State the moral right to summon the militia to protect property?

A. He has that right.

Q. I would ask the lecturer if he desired to give the impression that he was opposed to giving such a prerogative to the Governor of the State of Massachusetts?

A. I am opposed in a democracy, which is the only kind of government I believe in, to give such an authority to any individual.

Q. To whom would he give that right in case of absolute necessity?

A. I would have that right determined by a majority of the community where the conditions exist.

VIII. DEMOCRACY AND INDUSTRY

THERE are plenty of people who think there is no need to have a commission to discover the causes of industrial unrest. They are quite sure that they know them. There are some folks who take refuge in the comfortable belief that industrial unrest is a manufactured product, turned out by a group of agitators. Unfortunately for that theory, industrial unrest appears usually ahead of the arrival of the agitator. The so-called agitator is really an effect and not a cause. Various types of labour organisations may contribute to industrial unrest, but they themselves are simply evidences and expressions of it. It is a thing that is social as well as industrial. You can find it existing in China and in Japan just as it does in England and in the United States, and if you think you can stop it by suppressing the agitators, you will find that even though you could smash every trade union, sweep the Socialist party out of the political field and consign all the I. W. W. speakers to darkest dungeons, your industrial unrest would still persist with the same degree of spirit and force that it now persists.

There are some other folks who think that industrial unrest is nothing more or less than the struggle of the group that is deprived of this world's goods to secure more comforts and some luxury. They believe, therefore, that industrial unrest can be assuaged by an increase of wages or an improvement of working conditions. Now while, of course, the first and fundamental demand of labour is for its due and just share in the material gain of civilisation, it is something more than that. It is a desire for self-expression. It is a desire to share not simply in the gains of civilisation, but in the control of civilisation. You can satisfy the desire for material gains and you will not by so doing stop industrial unrest. For what you are facing here is not the rumbling of individual stomachs which are hungry. It is the stirring of the soul of the race. And those who have been dealing so long with columns of figures that they have forgotten what the soul of man is like had better take heed of the fact that it is the soul of man and not his stomach that is stirring in this labour movement.

When you see a widespread unrest in any period of human history instead of looking for particular causes you had better get down underneath the surface and see what is moving there to make the eruptions. At any time of widespread social unrest in human history you will

always find underneath the surface the stirring of some great idea, of some supreme ideal that is coming to birth. The ideal that is stirring behind the industrial and social unrest of our age — and you cannot determine its cause adequately by treating it merely as industrial unrest — the ideal that is stirring down there is the ideal of democracy. It is that ideal of life which is the great contribution to history of that little and peculiar people that used to live in that little strip of land that runs up and down one side of the Mediterranean but who have since become citizens of the world, and have carried that idea and that ideal to the utmost corners of the earth. It is the idea which has always lain unexpressed in the mind of men. It is the ideal which has always been nurtured down at the bottom of the human race and which has found its clearest and its loftiest expression in the mouth of the Working Man of Galilee. For what is stirring here is his great teaching of the uttermost worth of the downmost man,— the truth that every life must count as one and no life must count as more than one. But that fundamental principle of the absolute and eternal worth of every individual personality is not democracy. If that be all you take out of the lips of the Carpenter in order to organise around it your political and industrial life, you have nothing whatever but individual-

ism. If that is all you take, it will lead you, of course, into philosophic anarchism. But Jesus taught that the uttermost worth of that downmost man could only be realised as life was organised in brotherhood for that purpose. Here is the fundamental principle of democracy, that life must be organised in brotherhood for the purpose of realising the eternal worth that belongs to every individual soul.

That principle has been slowly making its way in human history and it has been destroying all despotisms — despotisms of state and of church. It has made impossible feudal aristocracies along with despotic empires. It is making impossible all priestly hierarchies howsoever organised and in whatsoever terms concealed. Now that principle comes to make its way in the industrial world. That principle which has been expressing itself so vitally and powerfully in the state and in religion is now confronted by an industrial system that is organised on the same principle as the old aristocratic, despotic, militaristic state; namely, the principle of the right of the strong to rule and to use the weak to their advantage. And that is something more than a feudal workshop. It means not simply a feudal workshop but an autocratic administration and organisation of finance. It means that your whole industrial system from the labour of the handworker

to the control of the common capital upon which life depends is in despotic hands. Industry is suffering just as much from boss rule in the control of its financial system as it is from the despotic control of the worker in the workshop. What you have here is the absolute enthronement of the despotic principle in industrial life and the whole stirring of industrial unrest is the rebellion of the democratic spirit against that despotic organisation of industry. In so far as it is the expression of the working men in the labour movement, it is the voice of their determination to be captains of their own souls and masters of their own fates. It is the expression of their determination that no other man or group of men shall control or limit their lives. They have found themselves to count in the present industrial scheme of things quite often as nothing more or less than a thing that is bought and sold in the marketplace. They have found themselves counted simply as a number on a payroll, or reckoned merely as an item in a cost sheet, and now they are expressing their voice and their will in the great determination that every worker shall find the expression of his personality in the place where he works. Men who have come to take place and part in the commonwealth, who have come to feel that they do count

as one in the life of the state, are going hereafter to count as one in the industrial world.

INDUSTRIAL DESPOTISM AND ITS RESULTS

Is there such a fact as industrial despotism in the United States? Can it be that in this land of freedom and liberty, in this country that has not simply shouted but shrieked democracy in the face and the ears of all the world, that here despotism still lingers? You have on record the determined opposition of those in control of some of our greatest industries to any organisation of labour whatsoever, and if that be not the fundamental expression of the despotic principle, what is it? You have in the steel industry the record in sworn testimony before a commission that men have been discharged for forming any kind of organisation lest it should become a trade union. You have the record of men discharged for going as a committee to ask for such a thing as relief from seven day work. You have the record before the Industrial Commission of the men who control the coal industry of Colorado refusing even the principle of a grievance committee, refusing even that elemental expression of the democratic principle, asserting in the face of modern democracy the absolute prerogative of despotic ownership and despotic control. You

have your whole movement of the National Manufacturers' Association, with its promoters proclaiming their intention to rescue the country from bad unions and bad leadership and to establish the fundamental principle of liberty in the open shop, organising time after time a closed shop against the workers. Then you have a good many common people repeating the same foolish cry, that the principle of trade unions is all right but the trouble is that it has such bad leadership. Now I want to ask if the people who use that logic are willing to apply it to capitalism? Because what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, and if the whole principle of trade unionism is wrong because it has some bad men for its leaders sometimes, then by the same token there is plenty of evidence to prove that the whole system of capitalism is wrong for the same reason.

You have something more than the opposition to labour organisations as the expression of the despotic principle in industry. You have the successful attempt to control the whole life of the worker, to control his whole social necessities. You have seen established private baronies, feudal baronies within the state. That they are sometimes benevolent baronies does not for the moment affect the issue. The issue is, that here you have the expression of the despotic principle.

As one old Finnish striker put it out in Calumet last year. He said:

"It is this way. I work for the company, and my wife she must buy at the company store. My kid he must go to the company school, and my girl if she want a book she must go the company library. If I want me a bath I must go to the company bath house, and if my kid gets sick he must go to the company doctor. Now I go on strike. I get into a row. The company sheriff arrests me and they put me in the company jail. They take me to court and the judge, he is a pretty good fellow, he say 'You are alright. You can go,' but the company what do they do? They say, 'We have not got him yet, but never mind, we fix him, we get his damn head pretty soon.' Now I'm getting old. Pretty quick I die. And when I die I want to go to heaven. I hope so. But if the company own heaven I want to go to hell right quick."

Out in Colorado it was something worse than that. It was not simply the attempt to benevolently control the life of the workers, but it was the actual control of all the civil and legal rights of the workers. There are coal camps out there where the very road into the camp, the very highway, is the property of the coal companies and no man comes and goes on that highway except at their will; where they own the schoolhouse and

the church, the store and the saloon,— every facility for the life of the worker; where the only civil official in the camp is the paid employé of the corporation — he is both judge, jury and executor — and where anybody who does not meet with their approval is told to go down the canyon, and if they do not choose to go down the canyon they get beaten up or shot. Now that is all on record, in sworn testimony. It is a fact that we have had set up here in this United States absolute despotic control of industry. What is the reason that this despotic principle still lingers in the industrial world? It is the desperate attempt of some to cling to rights and privileges which the reason and conscience of mankind have decided do not belong to any one group of people, and labour in resisting such despotism is fighting not simply its own battle but it is fighting the battle for all of us. It is fighting the battle for the common liberties and the common freedom of all the people. For the attempt to retain despotic control and absolute prerogative and privilege goes out far beyond the control of the terms and conditions of labour. Those who maintain it see clearly that if labour pushes its power much farther in the way of securing material gains, it comes to the point where those material gains can only be secured at the cost of some diminution of profit. It is the clinging to

that special privilege, the despotic right of one group to individually determine what shall be its share of the common product of toil that is behind this repression of the organisation of labour. If the greater attempt to extend that same despotic control over the common interests of life, over the resources upon which all of us depend can succeed (and how near it comes to being done in this country there is evidence in plenty), if that can be done, the group that can do it in their taxing power upon the common wealth of the world, in their indirect control of the life and liberties of the people, have a power undreamed of by the empire makers of the past.

The necessity is upon those who care anything for the principle of democracy to see clearly that in resisting despotic power in the workshop, labour is fighting a battle of freedom for the whole commonwealth. And if some of you think that those who speak and write on these questions are inclined to unduly favour the side of labour, you must remember this, that we are speaking impersonally,— if we can. We are speaking as Lincoln spoke, and you remember his words. He said: "If it comes to a question between capital and labour, labour must take priority, because labour precedes capital and there is no capital without it."

Now Lincoln was not talking in personal terms

about groups of capitalists and groups of labourers. He was talking impersonally about two great social principles, about two great social forces, and the only sound public policy by which democracy can be maintained is that policy that Lincoln there enunciated, with prophetic insight at that time. In standing upon that ground we are resisting of course the divine rights of capital, which have been claimed, for despotism always claims divine rights. And it needs them, too. "Me and God" is always the voice of the despot. But he will need something more than that before he can make headway against the worldwide ground-swell of the incoming tide of democracy, whether he be in government or industry. The divine right of capital, you know, has been publicly proclaimed in the United States. They do it in more refined language in these days. They have learned better. But it was publicly proclaimed. We were told, that the Almighty in his great wisdom had selected these men of superior intelligence and superior character as the guardians of the destinies of the rest. Well, if God did that He is blinder than justice is usually painted. The capitalistic mind expresses itself in more delicate and subtle terms these days. It does not offend so grossly the conscience and the reason of democracy, and let me say that not all capitalists have the capitalistic mind by a long

way and not all industrial managers have it. Somebody raised a question here yesterday as to whether some of the judges of Massachusetts had not come up from below. From my experience of industrial managers who have come up from below some of the hardest and most brutal oppressers of their fellowmen are those who came up from the bottom. And so when I speak of the capitalistic mind, I speak again impersonally. Its full fruitage is both arrogant and blasphemous in its claims of superior intelligence and knowledge and of its special privilege of alliance with the Almighty. When you get it in its worst form it says that workers are beasts of a different order, and it says the teachers and the preachers are silly dreamers who ought to be pushed out of the way of the practical men who know how the world ought to be run.

Against that capitalistic mind, which is the stupidity of despotism, the world must and will make its headway into the land of reason and justice and brotherhood. What are the results of despotism in this country, industrially speaking? What are the fair fruits of industrial despotism? Serfdom, first of all. The weak and the dependent fall into a condition of servility. I go sometimes to industrial plants in industrial communities where men are afraid to talk because the shadow of fear hangs over them. And

where you have that you have also corruption. There is where you have your spies, sometimes holding office in labour organisations, and where you have that at the bottom, clear up to the top you can find the poison of graft and corruption. Despotism never has been able to maintain itself in the world except by spies and corruptors. Then among the strong you get rebellion. Among the strong you get the only answer that independent men can make to despotism and espionage, and of course you get the spirit of revolution. You have always had it as the answer to despotism in all history, and if you want the real reason for such an outrage as the McNamara incident you have it as the last weapon against despotism. And if you want the fundamental reason for Colorado, it is because the mine owners of Colorado absolutely denied the principle of democracy.

There are many contributing causes, on both sides, to the labour conflict, but the fundamental cause of the conflict is the denial of one of the inherent rights of mankind. And when you have that, what do you have? You do not have simply the hell of open warfare, but you have the hellish poison of hate brewing and coursing through the veins of the group at the bottom until you have an iron wedge driven through your community life, with men and women on both sides of it who

have lost reason and faith and fraternity and who face each other with hatred and suspicion. How long will it be before Belgium forgets, and how long will it be before the workers forget Ludlow? Worse than all the brutal outrage of the conflict is the poison of hate that is left to run its way through generations yet to come. After that reckoning, you get on the other side inefficiency and finally degeneracy, for that is the price of despotism. Those who wield it perish by it. It destroys them. I go through those industries that have become despotic close corporations, and if that is what you call efficiency, then the less we have of it the better. What about the workers in what is perhaps the most despotically organised industry in this country? What about the large group of workers that are working twelve hours a day, and what about the social result of that in the body politic? What about the type of life that you find in those twelve hour communities? You will find that it is losing a large part of its productive efficiency. Because of the fact that it blocks the avenue of approach from the bottom, it is making a dead level at the top and you are getting a mediocrity of management. Along with that you have the fact of friction in the industrial world because you have it split and divided there with suspicion and hatred. You can get efficiency out of despotism in a militaris-

tic organisation of life, but in a democratic country with a democratic people who rebel against despotic autocracy it is the most inefficient type of management possible. The result is that you get from such inefficiency in management corresponding inefficiency in life. Will you take that steel industry again, will you read the history of the steel families, and then will you tell me whether that type of industrial management has benefited the people who used it? There is another evil. The spirit of despotism at the top breeds an answering despotism at the bottom. It takes the kindly, simple democratic spirit of the plain humble folk at the bottom and transforms that into the hellish likeness of its "betters." The answer to the despotic claim of capital, "This is ours. We own it and we will run it," is the despotic answer of labour. And that is the worst result that can come from it, for labour wants to remember that it cannot find the day of redemption by seeking power for itself. It is its own worst enemy in that process. The same demoralising and degenerating results which have followed despotism at the top will follow it when exercised at the bottom, and if labour would save its own soul and save the rest of us it must cling at any cost to the fundamental democratic principle. In the day of its power it

must organise life not simply for the working class but for all the children of men.

Mankind will have democracy. It will not see the fruits that it has gained in the state destroyed. It will not see the industrial despots control the state for their own ends, and religious freedom destroyed by the subtle control of intellectual processes by the militaristic powers of capital. We have got government of the people and for the people, and the essential industrial needs of the people shall yet be controlled by the people and for the people.

METHODS OF INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

The methods are first the democratic control of the local workshop, and for the best form of that you can take the old town meeting fashion of absolute publicity of everything for everybody concerned. The people who are opposing trade unions have laid upon them the responsibility of offering something better, and until they do their sincerity is naturally in question. The next step after the democratic control of the workshop is the extension of that principle through the co-operative organisation of the local workshop. We have several in this country but co-operation develops slowly. We have only got democracy in the government after a long and slow pro-

cess of education. The school house open and free was the first thing, and the next thing was the chance to gain experience through expression of political powers. And we shall only get industrial democracy after a long and slow process. The first step will be through the actual control of workshops by the workers. The more all the workers continually and persistently take part in it the better is its contribution towards democracy. The development of democracy in industry will result in the elective control of industry. It is not going to be possible to stop industrial democracy simply with joint agreements between two armed forces facing each other. That may be nothing but a truce between two despotisms from which the rest of the community may have to suffer, such as a possible truce between those two controlling groups in Colorado. The only way you are going to stop that industrial anarchy out there ultimately is for the people to take hold of those coal mines and operate them for themselves. We are going to pass through a period of state socialism. Every civilised nation is tending in that direction, and experience and knowledge and co-operative power is growing among us. When the nations of the world come into the full consciousness of what can be done collectively in destruction, they are going to do the same thing that has been done in

war-time over in Europe for the construction of a sound basis for everyday life. The chief functions of the state now are repressive, but slowly and surely we are going to remove the things that needed pressure. The two chief costs of the state to-day are war and crime, militarism and degeneracy. Both of those are socially preventable and mankind is beginning to resolve that they shall be prevented. Then you will have no need for many of the present functions of the state. The state is going to consist in the co-operative action of all the people to carry on the necessary business of life and to develop the cultural aspects of life. That is going to be the type of state in the future.

The dream of the later Syndicalists is something more than a dream, it is a forecast of the process of social evolution. Absolute industrial and social democracy is the complete summation both of the ideals of the race and the social progress of the race. And if this appears so far in the future that it seems to be enveloped in the mist, I say to you look back first into the past and see how far we have travelled. What a step is there between our present power of collective action in the modern state and the power of the nomadic clan. When you go back of that a still further step how far is it back to when the cave man slept with a cudgel at his side? And if we

have gained so much in collective power how much more shall we not gain in the future? How far have we journeyed since Jesus confronted Cæsar and the principle of democracy took final issue with the principle of autocracy — and in that day, mind you, the family as well as the state was established on that despotic principle. The road that we have to go to reach the end of our dreams is shorter than the road that mankind has travelled. And what is more, in the past they plodded their weary way in darkness, but to-day the road — its course at least — lies plain before us and the tools for its making are here ready to our hand. "O ye of little faith and dull of heart!" The men who are making the world of to-morrow are the men who, both in the ranks of capital and of labour, are seeking for the democratic method in industry. They are the path-makers. They are the trail-blazers. Those who put their feet on those first faint trails of industrial democracy are helping to make the great highways over which the millions of the future shall walk into the land of justice and righteousness, and that only will be the land of plenty.

Q. In view of the conditions against them, can the working class be blamed for wasting their lives by drink and foolish living?

A. I hold it to be not only the duty of the workingman and woman but of every other good citizen of the Brotherhood of Man that they shall make their lives the fittest possible lives that all their energies may be thrown into this great struggle.

Q. You have based your addresses on the ethics of the Carpenter, do the preachers who are shouting for Billy Sunday base their position on the ethics of the Carpenter?

A. Every man can speak only for himself, and I have no intention of passing judgment on any other man, but I want to express one of the deepest convictions of my life, that the only effective way to get the great working class of this country to personally follow the Carpenter is to follow him in the fight for social justice.

Q. Would you advise the support of the Socialist party as it is to-day in carrying out your ideals as set forth in this course of lectures?

A. I have seen so many things in the past about the alliance between church and state and its results that I must insist that that is a question which belongs only to the conscience of every individual man.

Q. Should we have more schools?

A. What we need is not the education simply of men's minds, what we need is the education of all the capacities of men for the fullest possible kind of life. That is the kind of education we need.

Q. Does the American working man lack co-operation? Is that the reason?

A. It is, because owing to our late economic development here the spirit of individualism lingers stronger here than it does in Europe.

Q. I would ask the lecturer if during this course of lectures he is speaking as a teacher of ethics or as a socialist?

A. I am speaking merely as a teacher of ethics.

Q. Do you think that the trade unions stand in the way of democracy?

A. There are some aspects of the union that do stand in the way of democracy, but no working man of to-day ought to forget that the long battle of trade unionism for industrial democracy is entitled to the respect of every working man in so far as it stands for democracy.

Q. After all the unions have done for the workers how can you say they do not stand for democracy?

A. The speaker misquoted me. I said there were some aspects of the trade union that were

opposed to democracy, but that it stood fundamentally for the principles of democracy.

Q. Do you not think you have overdrawn the case in favour of the worker and against the capitalist?

A. My answer would be the statement that I made in the course of the address, that I was talking not in personal terms but in impersonal terms. Of course, in the individual cases there is something different to be said on both sides.

Q. Would these ethical ideals you have advocated be obtained more quickly by an internal revolution of the individual or the external revolution against industry?

A. Those are two things which cannot be separated. Society is an organic thing and individuals are organically related to it.

Q. Do you think that there would be a decrease of violence in Boston if the police would take away guns and police clubs from the police?

A. If the policeman realised that he was a social servant we should have a great deal less disturbance on our streets.

Q. Would it not be possible for all people with the democratic idea to work in unison without action by the government?

A. When the people get together they are the government.